



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



Per. 971 e. $\frac{130}{7}$





THE
JOURNAL
OF
SACRED LITERATURE.

~~~~~  
EDITED BY JOHN KITTO, D.D., F.S.A.  
~~~~~

VOLUME VII.



LONDON:
SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, & CO.,
STATIONERS' HALL COURT.
OLIVER AND BOYD, EDINBURGH; AND J. ROBERTSON,
GRAFTON STREET, DUBLIN.

—
1851.

London: Printed by WILLIAM CLOWES and Sons, Stamford Street.

THE
JOURNAL
OF
SACRED LITERATURE.

Nº XIII.—JANUARY, 1851.

CONTENTS OF No. XIII.—Vol. VII.

	Page
NINEVEH	1
THE JANSENISTS, AND THEIR REMNANT IN HOLLAND .	34
THE SEPTUAGINT	83
THE THEORY OF HUMAN PROGRESSION	126
LETTER AND SPIRIT IN THE OLD TESTAMENT SCRIPTURES .	146
JOHN CALVIN	162
FIRST LESSONS IN BIBLICAL CRITICISM	174
ON THE INTERPRETATION OF 1 CORINTHIANS vii. 25-40 .	190
OUR LORD'S DISCOURSES AND SAYINGS	201
ANNOTATIONS ON THE NEW TESTAMENT	210
CORRESPONDENCE:— <i>Tenses of Hebrew Verbs; On the Interpretation of Romans ix. 3; Dr. Tregelles' Prospectus of a Critical Edition of the Greek New Testament</i> . . .	216
Notices of Books	235
Biblical Intelligence	251
Quarterly List of English and Foreign Works in Sacred Literature	253

THE
JOURNAL
OF
SACRED LITERATURE.

Nº XIV.—APRIL, 1851

CONTENTS OF No. XIV.—VOL. VII.

	Page
EGYPT	257
ON THE WORDS WHICH PAUL HEARD IN PARADISE . . .	292
INSPIRATION	315
RITTER ON THE EXPLORATIONS OF THE RIVER JORDAN AND THE DEAD SEA	334
MODERN SPIRITUALISM	360
PARALLELISTIC POETRY	378
ON THE DAIMONIAIC POSSESSIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT	394
ON THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES . .	406
TISCHENDORF'S SEPTUAGINT	413
GILFILLAN'S BARDS OF THE BIBLE	419
RECONSIDERED TEXTS, Nos. III. & IV.	428
THE JEWISH WAR UNDER HADRIAN AND TRAJAN . . .	439
MISCELLANEA:— <i>Ephes. v. 14; Paul's Thorn in the Flesh</i> .	447
ANALECTA BIBLICA	451
CORRESPONDENCE:— <i>Dr. S. P. Tregelles on the Textual Criti-</i> <i>cism of the New Testament; Dr. Samuel Lee on the Tenses</i> <i>of Hebrew Verbs; On the Interpretation of Romans ix. 3;</i> <i>On the Proper Subjects of Faith and Prayer</i> . . .	459
Notices of Books	495
Biblical Intelligence	515
Quarterly List of English and Foreign Works in Sacred Literature	517

THE
JOURNAL
OF
SACRED LITERATURE.

~~~~~  
NO. XIII.—JAN. 1851.  
~~~~~

NINEVEH.

Nineveh and its Remains ; with an Account of a Visit to the Chaldean Christians of Kurdistan, and the Yezidis, or Devil-Worshippers ; and an Inquiry into the Manners and Arts of the Ancient Assyrians. By AUSTEN HENRY LAYARD, Esq., D.C.L. Seventh Thousand, 2 vols. 8vo. Murray, 1849.

Notes from Nineveh, and Travels in Mesopotamia, Assyria, and Syria. By the Rev. J. P. FLETCHER, 2 vols. 12mo. Colburn, 1850.

Nineveh and Persepolis : an Historical Sketch of Ancient Assyria and Persia, with an Account of the recent Researches in those Countries. By W. S. W. VAUX, M.A. Arthur Hall, Virtue, and Co., 12mo. 1850.

Nineveh : its Rise and Ruin, as illustrated by Ancient Scriptures and Modern Discoveries. A Course of Lectures delivered at Claremont Chapel, London. With Additions and Supplementary Notes. By the Rev. JOHN BLACKBURN. Partridge and Oakey, 1850, 16mo. 232 pp.

IF we could conceive the invention of the diving-bell to have been postponed for some thirty centuries, and at the end of that period applied to the examination of the Royal George ; presuming also that that vessel shall have been left comparatively uninjured by time and the action of the water, a notion might be formed of an unborn generation obtaining a glimpse of certain characteristics of our own times. If it were possible for other sources of information to have perished, or to have survived only in a scanty form, there would still be much that they could learn from

the discovery of a sunken ship. Her guns and small arms would indicate the mode of our warfare ; her compasses, sextants, and charts, would record our science ; and although, in the case we have happened to select, probably but few pictures, and still less sculpture would be found, the arts of construction would be magnificently illustrated in the vessel itself. Evidence of this kind is in many instances all that remains to us, enabling us to form conceptions of the manners and customs of extinct peoples. Mutilated statues, fragmentary architectural remains, warlike and domestic instruments encrusted with venerable oxide, frescoes from which certain pigments have refused to disappear, are the memoranda obscurely noted in the world's chronicle. Nevertheless, though they be obscure when presented alone, they are valuable as auxiliaries. They are like the pictorial illustrations of a printed book which in themselves are adapted to amuse those superficial readers who can manage to enjoy 'looking at the pictures,' but to a less juvenile student throw light upon its learned contents. The reader will be able to call to mind those extraordinary discoveries in America, which are as the pictures without the book ; or the tombs of Etruria, which record the civilization of a people of which we know little more than the name. Carthage has bequeathed us no literature, and its débris, while they tell us of its warlike as well as its commercial activity, give us but a meagre conception of its cultivation of the mind and of the taste.

We may regard these various remains as proposing a series of speculations on the progress of man as a civilized being. The idea is very common with ourselves, that our own civilization is an advanced development of what has uniformly progressed from the earliest times. Without giving the subject much thought, we contrast the painted bodies of our aborigines with the Exhibition of 1851, and inasmuch as railways, and electric telegraphs, and national schools, and an efficient post-office, are things that have sprung up within our own memory, we infer that progress is the law now, and, *ergo*, has always been so. Unfortunately, antiquarian discoveries suggest the perplexing inference that *retrogression* has been at work in various ages. Ormuzd has sent one and Ahriman the other. Any thinking man who will take the trouble this year to pay alternate visits to the cast-iron building in Hyde Park and to the Ionic edifice in Bloomsbury, will confess to some difficulty in expounding the laws by which civilization has moved, or in determining by what marks we can at any time best estimate its measure. It would appear to have (as mathematicians would say) several maxima and minima. Like an undulating country, it rises and descends : it has its valleys and its mountains. In fact nations, when blessed with prosperity, appear in all ages of the

the world to make rapid advances in the material arts, and not less so in the productions of the intellect. Everything that can survive the lapse of time, the records of literature, art, and occasionally of science, tell us that these things have culminated in times that we are accustomed to think dark. Powerful minds have swayed the coming centuries, and compelled their allegiance. Homer, Aristotle, and Phidias, Cicero and Seneca, are exerting an influence now greater probably than in their own times. Egypt, we shall say, had no steam-engine, no hydraulic press, but how did those big stones find their way to the top of those amazing piles?

The mysterious truth is this, viz., that the element of barbarism has always been at hand, ready to stay the progress of intellect and social amelioration. At this very day a glance over the map of the world reminds us that civilization is as unequally distributed over the world's surface as it has been through the world's generations. Northern Asia and Northern India have their formidable nomadic tribes ready to play the same part that Calmuck Tartars and European hordes have played in past centuries. The darkness of the middle ages frowns gloomily between the enlightened first and nineteenth centuries, just as on the map the condition of nations lends intermediate shades to countries lying between those where Christianity is allowed to shine forth. What, then, is the conclusion at which we arrive? These mutilated fragments suffice to reveal to us, that nations have at intervals arrived at lofty elevations from which a Power (which probably they had defied) prostrates them in the dust, consigns their monuments to the hand of the spoiler, their institutions to barbarism, and causes their very name to be blotted out.

Whatever interest attaches to the ordinary relics of bygone civilization, it is for many reasons inferior to what is awakened by the discovered monuments of NINEVEH. In this instance the Bible is the book to which these discoveries serve as illustrations. We had heard of Nineveh before M. Botta or Mr. Layard had removed a spade-full of earth. We had heard of Jonah's preaching to the wicked inhabitants of that 'exceeding great city of three days journey.' The names of Pul and Tiglath Pileser, and Sennacherib, were familiar. The instruments of captive Israel's punishments could not but awaken our interest; and this interest was mysteriously enhanced by the obscurity of this great city's destruction. To use the fine language of Mr. Fletcher—'From the neighbouring regions of Alkosh went forth the accents of doom. The bloody city, the city of robbery and lies, must perish. Hosts of barbarians rush from the neighbouring hills, overpower the effeminate and feeble inhabitants, and Nineveh falls, even as a
gallant

gallant ship that founders in the midst of the solitary and trackless ocean, leaving no trace of her existence, no floating memorial of her fate.' Thus the knowledge we had was only just enough to awaken a thirst for more. The Bible tells us a *little*, Herodotus does not pass over Babylonia in silence, Diodorus Siculus and others have contributed their scattered hints, but after all, how limited is our knowledge! How welcome, consequently, are Mr. Layard's bas-reliefs and Major Rawlinson's cuneiform inscriptions.

There is a further consideration by which Nineveh arrests attention; and its monumental remains awaken a yet more intense curiosity. Assyria was not only the earliest of empires, but its territory was the cradle of the human race. Civilization is here traced to its very source. If the traveller deserves the thanks of mankind who, in some remote spot of the interior of Africa, finds the bubbling spring whose rivulet swells into the rolling waters of the Nile, what does he deserve who near the foot of Mount Ararat, and in the plain of Shinar points out the metropolis of Old Assyria, and reveals to an astonished world the sculptured memorials of those paulo-post-diluvians? It is the source of a yet mightier river than Nile or Tigris, and though its waters have been lost in swamps, the stream has emerged and rolled along, and we are borne upon its waters. We cannot evade the thought of human relationship when we contemplate the stream so near its source. We have more to do with old Nimrod, 'that cunning hunter,' than we were disposed to think. But if, as sons of Japhet, we repudiate him as a descendant of Ham, we may, as we stand in the same place, think of Chaldæa and its unpretending Ur, from whence he went forth who was 'the father of the faithful,' in 'whose seed all the families of the earth are blessed.'

It will be unnecessary here to say much by way of a first introduction to our readers of the more important work of those enumerated at the head of this article, as the fame of its learned and enterprising author has already spread through all lands, and identified itself with the very name of Nineveh. The planet Neptune is associated with the names of Le Verrier and Adams, and if the observer employed by the former had the good fortune to be the first to bring the luminary into the field of his telescope and proclaim its discovery to the world, it is well known that the calculations of Adams were first completed, and found subsequently to be more elegant in their structure and more thoroughly developed in their working. Thus did France and England simultaneously lay claim to a celestial discovery. Botta and Layard have, in a manner not dissimilar, established their fame by revealing to the world the buried monuments of Nineveh. In this,

as

as in the other instance, the Frenchman was first in the race, but the idea of excavating the mounds of Nimroud originated with the English traveller before the investigation of Kouyunjik or Khorsabad was attempted. The two volumes of Mr. Layard are themselves imperishable monuments of British energy as well as literary acuteness. Many readers, however, will be denied access to them on account of their expensive form; and those who can enjoy the animated descriptions of the traveller, will not always be able to follow the elaborate speculations of the antiquary and Orientalist. Three other works are included in our notice, all of high merit, though each of different pretensions. Mr. Vaux gives us a valuable condensation of Assyrian history and discovery. No one whose curiosity is excited by one of Mr. Layard's winged lions or sculptured tablets can more effectually put himself in possession of the substance of what has been recorded by historians, observed by travellers from Xenophon downwards, excavated by Mr. Layard, and deciphered by Major Rawlinson, than by reading this unassuming volume, entitled *Nineveh and Persepolis*. It exhibits the most perfect acquaintance with the subject, an accurate familiarity with all the great authorities, and a rigorous determination to give to the reader a clear and unadorned synopsis of the whole field of investigation. Mr. Blackburn, in his *Rise and Ruin*, still further popularizes the subject. His lectures were orally delivered, and are, consequently, stamped with pulpit characteristics. His pictures are, from the nature of the case, engraven on the imagination; his images are those of rhetoric. The style is flowing and easy; and the whole treatment of the subject is adapted to sustain the most intense interest by the constant reference to Scripture; and this not only as bearing upon exegetical theology, but also as applying to the duties and hopes of the Christian man. Mr. Blackburn has admirably supplied the very thing that was wanting to our Nineveh literature, a popular Scriptural interpretation of these wonderful discoveries. We have no doubt that the work will be well received, and that a widely-extended sale will reward its reverend author. And the most gratifying results of a wide circulation will be the interest in Assyrian discovery awakened among the thousands of our working population, and we hope at the same time an increased estimation of the Scriptures of truth. Too much cannot be said in praise of the writer who, with popular powers at his command, seizes upon a subject to which the minds of men are at any given time strongly directed, and makes that topic a vehicle of eternal truth. Mr. Fletcher's *Notes from Nineveh* contain very much to interest the general reader. He, too, was engaged in an excavating expedition, but the mounds in which he dug were those of Nestorian ignorance. He
went

went to search for primitive Christianity, but, on removing the earth as well as he was able, found the doctrinal and intellectual structures very much in the condition of the crumbling alabaster of Kouyunjik. In fact, he considered the adherents of the papacy among these Oriental Christians as the most enlightened of those with whom he came in contact. His report, however, would appear to indicate that the American missionaries (with whom, by the way, he has no great sympathy) have found in the Nestorian churches a field of most useful labour, in which their efforts have not been unattended with success. Mr. Fletcher's work shows very many traces of learning, some dialectical acuteness, and no inconsiderable acquaintance with ecclesiastical history. If the work has a defect, it is a want of unity, and a slight tendency to mere book-making.

In introducing to our readers the subject which has been the theme of the writers we have enumerated, it will be necessary to direct attention to the great beginnings of Assyrian story.

The origin of Nineveh is, as we might expect, buried in somewhat uncertain tradition. But the locality, the name, fragments of history, secular as well as scriptural, the dim legends of the people who dwell between the Tigris and Euphrates, and we may now add, the testimony of these exhumed remains, all concur in pointing to that great city as one of the metropolitan cities of the first post-diluvian empire, in other words, the first resting-place of civilization. Mr. Fletcher has a theory on which he sets considerable value, and which is not unworthy of attention, that the surrounding tract of country is the plain of Shinar, in which the rebellious sons of men reared their tower, and was consequently the locality from which the dispersion took place. We are disposed to agree with him in assigning a position to the resting-place of the ark somewhat different to the Ararat of modern geographers. He says—

‘For several reasons I consider the common notion, that the Ararat of modern Armenia is the place indicated by Scripture, as founded on error, and as incompatible with the narrative of what followed the deliverance of the second founder of the human race. Nor is the opinion which assigns the Ararat of Armenia as the resting-place of the ark at all supported either by the literal interpretation of Scripture or by the testimony of accredited writers. The term Ararat is used in Hebrew to signify the mountainous country to the north and east of Assyria. In 2 Kings xix. 37, and Isa. xxxvii. 38, we are told that the sons of Sennacherib having assassinated their father, fled for refuge into the land of Ararat, or Armenia, as our translators render it, following the rendering of the LXX. and the Vulgate. Can it be supposed, then, that the fugitives would traverse the mountains of Kurdistan as far as the modern peak of Ararat, or that men bred up in the luxury

luxury and effeminacy of the Assyrian court would advance one step further in a barbarous and almost inaccessible region than was absolutely needful for their safety? We are compelled, therefore, to allow that the term *Ararat* must be taken as indicating the mountainous country in the vicinity of Nineveh; the same, in fact, which is known at the present day by the name of *Jebel Giodi*, or *Judi*, an evident corruption of the ancient *Gordi*. This supposition derives much additional weight from the authority of the Targumist *Jonathan*, who, in his gloss upon *Gen. viii. 4*, makes the ark to rest *על טורי דקורדון*, upon the mountains of *Kurdon* or *Gordon*, thus almost establishing the identity of the modern *Giodi* or *Judi* with the resting-place of the ark. With him agree most of the profane writers who have mentioned the Deluge, a list of whom will be found in *Bochart's Geographia Sacra*, cap. iii. To these I may add, the modern tradition still current among the Mohammedans and Christians of Assyria, that *Jebel Judi* received the survivors of the Deluge. Another remarkable coincidence is, the aptitude of the soil in the valleys of the *Judi* range for the rearing of the vine. The grape is still much cultivated among the Nestorians, and I regret to say, that they frequently abuse the bounty of Providence in the same manner that *Noah* is recorded to have done.*

This hypothesis does not appear otherwise than tenable, and if so, adds a peculiar interest to that primal city which would thereby be brought within a hundred miles due south of *Noah's* resting-place. *Wells*, in his *Geography of the Old and New Testament*, has in a measure anticipated *Mr. Fletcher's* argument, and brings good reasons for assigning the *Gordixean* range as the locale of *Ararat*. He shows, moreover, that the ark was probably built in *Babylonia*, of the gopher wood (or cypress) which abounds there, this being the wood of which *Alexander*, in after ages, built a fleet at *Babylon*, according to the testimony of *Arrianus*. He then argues that the current in which the waters of the *Persian gulf* would flow when the 'fountains of the great deep were broken up' probably took a northern direction, causing the ark to drift to the locality for which *Mr. Fletcher* now contends.

Let us now imagine *Shem*, *Ham*, and *Japhet* descending from their elevated asylum; the fertile plains of *Mesopotamia* naturally attracted them; and if, as *Wells* supposes, this was previously their home, we have no difficulty in understanding why it should again become so. A few years rolled on and that little family that had emerged from the ark swelled into a tribe, and the tribe into a nation. They were still in the land watered by the two rivers, and in that land built, or rather commenced building, the *Tower of Babel*.

* *Notes from Nineveh*, vol. i. p. 172.

What locality shall we assign to this transaction? The question is important, because there is every reason to suppose that Babel was the first of cities. Mr. Fletcher boldly disputes its identity with Babylon, or even that any city was reared in the immediate neighbourhood of the condemned tower. He says—

‘It would certainly seem more natural that the descendants of Noah should have settled themselves near to the mountains in which the ark rested, than that they should have emigrated three hundred miles through arid and desolate plains to the site of the later Babylon.’

He endeavours to strengthen the view that Nineveh had a priority of existence to all other cities by a reference to the etymology. He says—

‘The first syllable, nin or nun, implies in the Semitic language any floating substance, and was for that reason used afterwards to signify a fish. The suffix neveh, or nooh, has generally the signification of a resting-place or habitation, whence we may consider the name Nineveh as indicating the rest of the floating vessel or of the ark. It is likely that the sons of Noah would erect some memorial of their escape on their descent into the plains; and Asshur, who completed, or perhaps founded Nineveh, could hardly select a more appropriate title for his new city.’^b

All this is ingenious, but etymology and conjecture are but feeble instruments, and specially weak against the voice of universal tradition. Mr. F. wishes to persuade himself that the tower was either never reared much above its foundations, or that it was miraculously annihilated, in order that he may find room for the supposition of its having been commenced in the neighbourhood of Nineveh, possibly on the spot where a village called Babeel now stands. But let us follow the migratory band that found the plain in the land of Shinar and dwelt there (Gen. xi. 2). We will not stop to ask whether these early Chaldæans cultivated astronomy, and selected an unbroken plain for the erection of a huge observatory; nor whether they were Sabæans in religion, and needed a temple for the worship of the host of heaven. Their gigantic conception was undoubtedly a blasphemous defiance of the Most High, and as such was punished. The structure was of brick, and that it might be enduring, they discarded the *sun-baked* parallelopipeds of clay of which so many of these ‘ruinous heaps’ were built. ‘They said one to another, Go to, let us make brick, and burn them *thoroughly*. And they had brick for stone, and slime had they for mortar’ (Gen. xi. 3). This building we are constrained to believe, in spite of Mr. Fletcher, was the nucleus of great Babylon. To this day a gigantic mound of *kiln-burnt* bricks, bearing the name of the Tower of Babel, or

^b Vol. ii. p. 90.

Temple of Belus, stands upon the banks of the Euphrates, on the site of the once mighty 'Queen of the Nations.' The neighbourhood abounds in clay suitable for such an erection, and the well-known bitumen pits which are found there afforded an abundant supply of 'slime' for these old builders. Mr. Vaux, in his admirable work, gives us a long array of travellers who afford one unbroken chain of testimony as to the popular belief in various ages that this was the Tower of Babel. We will quote Mr. Vaux's own statement with regard to one or two of these witnesses:—

'Niebuhr, who visited the spot in 1765, seems to have had no doubt that Babylon once stood here, and mentions that it was still called Ard Babel, adding that hereabouts were evident traces of a once great city. On both sides of the Euphrates, according to him, were mounds, or little hills, which were discovered to be full of bricks. Between 1780 and 1790 M. de Beauchamp, who resided some years at Baghdad as the Pope's vicar-general, examined the ruins of Babylon. He says that these ruins are in the territory of Hillah, eighteen leagues southwest of Baghdad, on the banks of the Euphrates, and that they consist chiefly of bricks scattered about, with one principal tower, which Europeans take to be the Tower of Babel. He states that they are very conspicuous from Hillah, about one league north of the town, and that there is one of especial note, flat at the top, of irregular form, about thirty toises high, and much cut by furrows on the sides. The regular layers of bricks which are still visible, prove that it is not a natural hill, but the work of man. Beyond this mound are immense masses of building, near the river, and a mound called the Tower of Babel, or more generally by the Arabs, Mujellibé, which means "overturned."'

We need not stay to discuss whether the mound called Mujellibé, or that which is designated Birs Nimroud, has the better claim to be the old tower; we have simply referred to these statements to confirm our opinion that it is needless to form any other supposition with regard to the original colonists of Asia than that they travelled along the banks of the Euphrates, clustered for awhile at Babel, or Babylon, and were then, as we know full well, dispersed. No exact date can be assigned to this event, but we shall not err in supposing it early in the second century after the flood, or about B.C. 2247. We have now tolerably clear authority that Nineveh came into existence, and was probably founded by Nimrod. There is a general agreement to accept on this subject the marginal reading of Gen. x. 11. Rollin's comment is very much to the point:—

'From this country (Babylon) he went into that which has the name of Assyria, and there built Nineveh: De terrâ illâ egressus est Assur, et ædificavit Nineven. This is the sense in which many

• *Nineveh and Persepolis*, p. 172.

learned men understand the word Assur, looking upon it as the name of a province, and not of the first man who possessed it; as if it were, *egressus est in Assur, in Assyriam*. And this seems to be the most natural construction, for many reasons not necessary to be recited in this place. The country of Assyria is described in one of the prophets by the particular character of being the land of Nimrod: *Et pascent terram Assur in gladio, et terram Nimrod in lanceis ejus; et liberabit ab Assur, cum venerit in terram nostram* (Micah v. 6). It derived its name from Assur, the son of Shem, who without doubt had settled himself and family there, and was probably driven out or brought under subjection by the usurper Nimrod.^d

It is certainly remarkable that the kingdom of Assyria, which was uniformly in subsequent times at enmity with God's chosen people Israel, should have had its origin in usurpation, and that a descendant of Shem should have been the displaced party. It was the early hostility of Ham and Shem reminding us of the struggles of Jacob and Esau (Gen. xxv. 22) at a later stage of their existence.

We may therefore conclude that Nimrod was the probable founder of Nineveh, and that the cities of Rehoboth, Calah, and Resen came into his possession. The Scriptural description of this primitive conqueror is laconic, but would appear to convey more than would be gathered from the popular interpretation of the words. 'He began to be mighty upon earth; he was a mighty hunter before the Lord; wherefore it is said, Even as Nimrod the mighty hunter before the Lord' (Gen. x. 9). This allusion to Nimrod's hunting is metonymical. It is clear that he knew how to rule over fiercer spirits than those of the beasts of the forest. If the first Apostles were styled by the more peaceful title of 'Fishers of men,' the first conqueror might well be called a hunter. Indeed, as they followed the double occupation, so did he. And this was reasonably to be expected in primitive times. Colonists in our day are often backwoodsmen, and their leaders must be expert with the axe and the rifle. These physical qualities have, under such circumstances, no slight connection with moral influence, especially with those who are little able to estimate endowments of a less material character. It is likely enough that Nimrod was the first who extended the family relationship (for they were all cousins at least) into political organisation; gave laws, and established military discipline. It is equally clear that his mode of government excluded the democratic element, and that the first empire which the world has seen was a pure despotism. It will be asked, however, whether it was possible for the grandson of Ham to find subjects enough to constitute a nation.

^d *Ancient History*, i. 61.

And here it is well to observe that human life had not yet been shortened to the standard of one hundred and twenty years, which was announced at the time of the Flood (Gen. vi. 3). The genealogy of Abraham seems to show that life was reduced by slow degrees, as his own father died at the age of two hundred and five years, just thirty years more than the measure to which he himself attained. If we suppose Nimrod to have flourished one hundred years after the Flood, and the length of human life to have been only according to the ordinary standard, we should be puzzled by the following description which Mr. Blackburn borrows from Justin, as quoted in Hales's *Chronology* :—

‘As for Nimrod, it is plain from the comments which profane history supplies to the sacred text, that he advanced in wickedness until he became an arch-usurper both in religion and government. He first invaded the dominions of his neighbours, and having subdued them, he employed their aid to extend his conquests till he had subjugated *all the nations of the west as far as Libya; and of the east as far as India.*’*

Truly those three sons of Noah had well replenished the earth, if the grandson of one of them could find such scope for his warlike prowess. But, as we have already remarked, human life was not yet contracted to its final limit. Nimrod may have lived to the age of Shem or Arphaxad, that is, to be five or six hundred years old. There were assuredly several generations living at once upon the earth, and thus the population advanced in an immensely rapid ratio. If two hundred and thirty years sufficed in after times to multiply even a persecuted family to six hundred thousand men, besides women and children, there is every reason to suppose that Nimrod, during his own life time, might have reigned over a populous nation, and that only one among the several nations of the earth. It is another question whether the arts of industry and war progressed with similar rapidity. Mr. Blackburn clings somewhat to the idea that the sculptures brought to light by Mr. Layard are of as high antiquity as the age of Nimrod himself, but seems at a loss to account for the progress of art which such an hypothesis includes, except by referring them to that kind of inspiration of which Bezaleel and Aholiab were undoubtedly partakers.

‘In the sacred Scriptures we have the earliest, and indeed the only account of the origin of the more ancient arts and sciences. The devout reader cannot fail to observe that the inspired writers do not hesitate to regard skill in mechanical occupations, and in the useful and elegant arts, as the gift of God.’† We scarcely

* *Rise and Ruin*, p. 21.

† *Ib.*, p. 27.

think it necessary to assign such a cause for the state of art at the period alluded to. The *world* was two thousand years old, and civilization was not of necessity *annihilated* by the Flood. How much of our own material advancement, we may ask, could three intelligent men transfer to some secluded settlement, teaching what they knew, not to debased savages, but to their own rapidly multiplying descendants. The question is curious, though it does not altogether admit of being tested. But it is clear that by subdivision of labour and concentration of individual study much could be done by the members of a community, although they had no other instruction than could be afforded by a man of general knowledge, even if he were without practical skill in any one species of handicraft. Now Shem, Ham, and Japhet were at least naval architects, and acquired most probably in the construction of the ark an acquaintance with nearly all the arts connected with civilized life. Consequently, there was every opportunity of transferring ante-diluvian civilization to post-diluvian times, and the inference legitimately ensues that the high art displayed in the Nimrod sculptures is of itself no proof against their date approximating to that of a period not long subsequent to the Flood. Mr. Layard has not assigned dates. The fall of Nineveh took place in the year 606 B.C. The remains themselves indicate the rebuilding of palaces, probably by the founders of the second Assyrian dynasty, out of the ruins of the palaces inhabited by their predecessors. Moreover, it is observed that the sculpture of the early period is superior in design and execution to that of the latter. We make these remarks in order that our readers may be able to form some conception of the extreme antiquity of the great Assyrian empire, and that there is every reason to suppose that the 'mighty hunter' was a potentate of no ordinary talent, and found himself at the head of a well organized kingdom. Mr. Blackburn goes so far as to conjecture that 'the king,' whose deeds of valour are recorded on the monumental tablets, may be Nimrod himself. The representations of wild-beast hunts and encounters with lions favour this idea. At any rate they corroborate the Scriptural account of Nimrod so far as this, viz., that if the first founder of the dynasty experienced a necessity of clearing his dominions of wild beasts, it was not unlikely that his successors may have rivalled his exploits. The lion-hunts recorded in the Nimrod palace are at least illustrations of the founder's feats.

There are many plausible conjectures that Nimrod, who was undoubtedly worshipped by the Babylonians under the name of Baal or Bel (a title which signifies no more than Lord), received similar honours from the Ninevites under the title of Nisroch.

The

The word Nisroch means an eagle or hawk, and would so far be expressive of what we have seen of Nimrod's personal qualities and pursuits. The eagle-headed figure which frequently occurs among the sculptured remains appears to have reference to some hero who was worshipped under this title, and may thus be described. A human body is surmounted with a head of an eagle or a vulture. The curved beak, of considerable length, is half open, and displays a narrow pointed tongue, which shows the remains of its original colouring of red paint. On the shoulders fall the usual curled and bushy hair of the Assyrian images, and a comb of feathers rise on the top of the head. It is furnished with two large spreading wings springing from the back. The right hand holds an object resembling a fir-cone, the left a square vessel or basket. The garments (which are in most cases elaborately executed) consist of a stole falling from the shoulders to the ankles, and a short tunic underneath descending to the knee; both of them richly and tastefully decorated with embroideries and fringes.^s

It is well to realize what is known concerning the foundation of Nineveh, as it reveals to us the extreme antiquity of that city which Mr. Layard has partially dis-interred. The testimony of Scripture is corroborated by the voice of popular tradition in regard to Nimrod's having been, if not the actual founder, at least one of its earliest rulers. From this point we plunge into the dark ages of Nineveh. It is to be lamented that the works of Ctesias and Berosus are known only by the scattered fragments which other writers have quoted, or we might have been in possession of a detailed history, instead of being left to uncertain conjectures. Moreover, the history of Nineveh is obscurely mingled with that of Babylon. The territorial name of Assyria is used often to include both.

The names of Ninus, Semiramis, and Ninyas, are familiar to us, as associated with the rise of this empire. The first-mentioned is supposed to have been the son of Nimrod, though the two are by many made identical. According to Diodorus Siculus the empire was extended under this prince over a vast territory, from Egypt as far as India and Bactriana.^h

^s In the Catalogue of the British Museum this figure is noted down under the distinctive title 'Nisroch,' but with a judicious query.

^h This is by no means improbable. The black obelisk now in the Museum obviously suggests the conquest of countries quite as far distant. The animals of the far East, elephants, antelopes, and monkeys among the rest, are legibly recorded as among the trophies of those campaigns. Major Rawlinson has deciphered the inscription on this obelisk, and found that it refers to conquests almost as vast as those which the historian assigns to Ninus, though it is not possible to discover the date.

According

According to the same historian, Nineveh owed much of its grandeur to Ninus. His design was to make it the largest and noblest city in the world, and to put it out of the power of those who came after him ever to build, or hope to build such another. Nor was he deceived in his view, for never did any city come up to the greatness and magnificence of this; it was one hundred and fifty stadia (or eighteen miles and three quarters) in length, and ninety stadia (or eleven miles and one quarter) in breadth, and consequently was an oblong square. Its circumference was four hundred and eighty stadia, or sixty miles. The walls of it were a hundred feet high, and of so considerable a thickness that three chariots might go abreast upon them with ease. They were fortified, and adorned with towers two hundred feet high.

Mr. Vaux sums up the obscure history of this early empire in a very clear paragraph. He says,—

‘It has been already stated that the heathen writers mention a long list of kings who succeeded the traditional founder of Nineveh, and that history has preserved scarcely any memorial of them. One or two of them, however, are incidentally mentioned. Thus we have Amraphel (Gen. xiv. 1), king of Shinar, in the time of Abraham, who with two others followed Chedorlaomer, king of the Elamites, in the war against the king of Canaan. Plato makes the kingdom of Troy dependent upon the Assyrian empire; and Ctesias says that Teutanus, the twenty-third king of Nineveh, sent Memnon with a body of troops to aid the Trojans. But what is most remarkable is, that it appears to have escaped the notice of the ancients, that there must have been at least two Assyrian dynasties, notwithstanding a passage in Herodotus would favour this supposition; for he states that Assyria was an independent kingdom after the revolt of the Medes. It seems clear that by the dissolution of the first empire the neighbouring states became separate kingdoms, and hence we have the distinct empires of the Medes and Persians, Babylonians and Assyrians. In the end the Assyrians yielded to the supremacy of the Medes, and Nineveh was overthrown by the united forces of Babylonia and Media. On this supposition the first dynasty must be considered as commencing with Ninus, and terminating with Sardanapalus, the kings of which are, as far as we at present know, mythical. The second, which may be called for distinction’s sake the *Scriptural*, begins with Pul, and ends with Saracus (or Ninus II.). Embracing, therefore, the earliest and the latest period, it is evident that there are three stages in the history.

‘1st Babylon, 2nd Nineveh, 3rd Babylon.

‘It is not probable (adds Mr. Vaux) that the two cities were at an equal pitch of glory at the same time.’¹

The first Assyrian king mentioned in Scripture is Pul, who is supposed to be the monarch to whom Jonah was sent. He in-

¹ *Nineveh and Persepolis*, p. 15.

vaded Israel in the reign of Menahem, about B.C. 769. He was succeeded by Tiglath Pileser, to the commencement of whose reign we may assign the date B.C. 747. Shalmaneser, called in Tobit Enemessar, succeeded Tiglath Pileser about B.C. 729. Sennacherib, who began to reign B.C. 714, was the unhappy leader of the vast host who perished in one night under the hand of the destroying angel. Under his son Nineveh fell. His Scripture name is Esarhaddon, the Persian form of which is Asser Adan Pul, latinized into Sardanapalus. This name is well known, but we may be allowed to remind our readers of the narrative of his character and end, transmitted to us by Diodorus and others. In musing over the ruins of Nineveh, it is interesting to recall the tale of its destruction. Sardanapalus is described as having surpassed all his predecessors in effeminacy, luxury, and cowardice. He never went out of his palace, but spent all his time amongst a company of women, dressed and painted like them, and employed like them at the distaff. He placed all his happiness and glory in the possession of immense treasures, in feasting and rioting, and the grossest self-indulgence. He ordered two verses to be put upon his tomb, which imported that he carried away with him all that he had eaten, and all the pleasures he had enjoyed, but left all the rest behind him.

‘ Hæc habeo quæ edi, quæque exaturata libido
Hausit ; at illa jacent multa et præclara relicta.’

An epitaph, says Aristotle, fit for a hog. Arbaces, governor of Media, having found means to get into the palace, and having with his own eyes seen Sardanapalus in the midst of his infamous seraglio, enraged at such a spectacle, and not able to endure that so many brave men should be subject to a prince more soft and effeminate than the women themselves, immediately formed a conspiracy against him. Belesis, governor of Babylon, and several others, entered into it. On the first rumour of this revolt the king hid himself in the inmost part of his palace. Being obliged afterwards to take the field with some forces which he had assembled, he at first gained three successive victories over the enemy, but was afterwards overcome and pursued to the gates of Nineveh ; wherein he shut himself, in hopes the rebels would never be able to take a city so well fortified, and stored with provisions for a considerable time ; the siege proved indeed of very great length. It had been declared by an ancient oracle that Nineveh could never be taken unless the river became an enemy to the city. These words buoyed up Sardanapalus, because he looked upon the thing as impossible ; but when he saw that the Tigris, by a violent inundation, had thrown down twenty stadia of the wall,
and

and by that means opened a passage to the enemy, he understood the meaning of the oracle, and thought himself lost. He resolved, however, to die in such a manner as, according to his opinion, should cover the infamy of his scandalous and effeminate life. He ordered a pile of wood to be made in his palace, and setting fire to it, burnt himself, his eunuchs, his women, and his treasures.

It is to be admitted, however, that the identity of Esarhaddon with Sardanapalus is disputed. It is to be observed, also, that the capture of Nineveh by Arbaces took place most probably B.C. 711, whilst the final overthrow of Nineveh has been dated with approximate accuracy at B.C. 606. All the discoveries which have hitherto been made show clearly enough that the great city was destroyed by fire: Khorsabad, Kouyunjik, and Nimroud, in this respect, tell the same tale.

The modern traveller who visits the scene of the old Assyrian empire treads on the débris of twenty-five centuries. The plain of the Tigris tells its own story, a story not inconsistent with past greatness and subsequent desolation; it is, in fact, the tomb of a mighty empire. 'In lieu of lofty palaces and gorgeous temples, the eye surveys only the mounds composed of their dead, or the miserable collections of huts which have arisen on their site. The gardens where Sardanapalus revelled are wasted and desolate; the sounds of soft and luxurious music, that once floated on the balmy Assyrian breezes, have yielded to the silence of devastation or decay.' It would appear that there never was a more effectual stay to improvement of any kind than Turkish sovereignty. Jerusalem, for example, is literally trodden under foot of the Gentiles, and hindered from assuming any other appearance than a scarcely habitable ruin. The earth of Palestine is as iron, and its sky as brass. The once fertile soil is made a desert because the cultivator can scarcely hope to reap where he has tilled and sown. The same galling incubus that weighs upon the land of Israel, weighs also upon the land once inhabited by Israel's hereditary foe. During a portion of the year the vast plain surrounding Nineveh bursts forth in variegated beauty; the earth yields her increase, and it is clearly seen that a vast population might subsist on nature's bounty. But the poor husbandman has foes on all hands. At the margin of the plain the eye rests upon the outline of the blue mountains of Kurdistan. That mountain-range nourishes in its bosom a wild, lawless race, from whose incursions the dweller on the plain has no adequate protection. But worse than the Kurdish robber is the Turkish Pasha. His exactions are arbitrary and oppressive. He has no sympathy of race, and instead of regarding a province as that which might, by the development of its resources, prove a source of strength to the
the

the central power, he looks upon it as he would on one of his own degraded slaves, an object on which he may vent his cruelty and caprice. In consequence of these combined causes 'the land mourns,' and that which might be a smiling plain becomes a howling wilderness. One of our travellers thinks he can discern in the sculptured portraits of old Assyrian kings and warriors the type of modern Chaldæan features. There is no great harm in the supposition, and, if true, it suggests at least the contrast, rendered still more palpable, between the flourishing condition of Assyria past and the degraded state of what remains of the country and its inhabitants.

The reader must picture to himself this Mesopotamian plain, edged by the blue mountains of Jebel Judi, whilst the rapid Tigris meanders through it like a silver thread. On either bank the eye detects, in clusters some few miles apart, small hills, which at first appear nature's own production. But this formation does not correspond to any geological system laid down by Murchison or Lyell. They are not volcanic rocks, nor are they stratified with alluvial deposits. They are simply the ruins of vast buildings. But it will excite wonder how any regularly-constructed edifices could, after any lapse of time, however great, pass into this irregularity of form. It is said that in the natural creation uniform colours and geometrical lines are scarcely to be discovered, and that even in the works of man Nature is ever striving to impress her own seal and assimilate them to her own type; but who would have supposed that rectangular palaces would become shapeless heaps, and present somewhat of the appearance of the ballast-hills that Sunderland coal-vessels have transferred from the bed of the Thames to the banks of the Tyne? The mystery is explained partly by a consideration of the material employed in many instances by the Assyrian builders. They made extensive use of sun-dried bricks, which were always liable to expand by moisture, and to crumble under the action of fire. Consequently, when a conflagration took place, the unroofed domicile was left in a condition in which its original form would speedily be lost. The crumbling walls became a heap of clay, which successive rains soon deprived of any regularity of shape. Besides this, it is to be remembered that hot winds prevail in those countries, which carry with them dense clouds of the finest dust. Human life can scarcely exist when assailed by these minute particles. It may readily be conceived that an abandoned dwelling will soon thereby be covered with a layer of soil, and that the plough may trace its furrows in which the corn shall wave over the banquetting-halls of Tiglath or Sennacherib. It may be added that the foundations of these old buildings, instead of being

under ground, were several feet above the surface: in other words, the palaces rose from elevated terraces of brick. This accounts for the vast quantity of material used in building, to which these mounds bear such remarkable testimony.

It is interesting to read Mr. Layard's own description of the mounds on which he has laboured so successfully. He is referring to the month of April, 1840, before he had explored the gigantic palaces otherwise than in imagination.

'As I descended the Tigris,' says he, 'in a raft, I again saw the ruins of Nimroud, and had a better opportunity of examining them. It was evening when we approached the spot. The spring rains had clothed the mound with the richest verdure, and the fertile meadows, which stretched around it, were covered with flowers of every hue. Amidst this luxurious vegetation were partly concealed a few fragments of bricks, pottery, and alabaster, upon which might be traced the well-defined wedges of the cuneiform character. Did not these remains mark the ruin, it might have been *confounded with a natural eminence*. A long line of consecutive narrow mounds, still retaining the appearance of walls or ramparts, stretched from its base, and formed a vast quadrangle; the river flowed at some distance from them; its waters, swollen by the melting of the snows on the Armenian hills, were broken into a thousand foaming whirlpools by an artificial barrier built across the stream.'

These shapeless mounds, rising like hills from the scorched plain, served to awaken the inner workings of Mr. Layard's enthusiastic mind. He contrasts the musings of the traveller who gazes upon these scenes after having left the more graceful ruins of Asia Minor and Syria, with the thoughts which were then habitual.

'He has left the land where nature is still lovely, where, in his mind's eye, he can rebuild the temple or the theatre, half doubting whether they would have made a more grateful impression upon the senses than the ruin before him. He is now at a loss to give any form to the rude heaps upon which he is gazing. Those of whose works they are the remains, unlike the Roman and the Greek, have left no visible traces of their civilization, or of their arts—their influence has long since passed away. The more he conjectures, the more vague the results appear; the scene around is worthy of the ruin he is contemplating; desolation meets desolation; a feeling of awe succeeds to wonder, for there is nothing to relieve the mind, to lead to hope, or to tell of what has gone by. These huge mounds of Assyria made a deeper impression upon me, gave rise to more serious thoughts and more earnest reflection, than the temples of Balbec and the theatres of Ionia.'

* *Nineveh and its Remains*, i. 7.

The actual excavations which Mr. Layard superintended, and which led to such important discoveries, were commenced at Nimroud in the month of November, 1845. Backed by the authority and supplied with the pecuniary resources of Sir Stratford Canning, he entered with enthusiasm upon the task which he had proposed to himself. He was not likely to meet with much encouragement from the Pasha of Mosul, nor from the inferior authorities at that place, the Cadi and Ulema: the Arabs of the Desert had prejudices and superstitions which were to be encountered. Under all these circumstances it was desirable that the first visit should be made in great secrecy. Four or five persons, well armed and supplied with necessary implements, descended the Tigris with the avowed pretence of hunting wild boars. At a village near the ruins Mr. Layard fell in with a half-starved Arab sheikh named Awad or Abd-Allah, and prevailed with him to render some assistance. It happened that the wandering Bedouins of those regions were not altogether ignorant of the nature of the ruins, and, as was naturally to be expected, had a good supply of traditions relating to them. On reaching the principal mound at Nimroud, evidence was soon afforded of the existence of sculptured remains: broken pottery and fragments of brick, on which arrow-headed characters could be traced, suggested more valuable remains beneath the surface. A piece of alabaster protruding through the soil was like a mast-head appearing at low tide, showing where the wreck lay. The spade and pickaxe were put in requisition—a large slab was the result; more digging produced a second and a third. In the course of the morning ten more were laid bare, forming a square, with the exception of a stone at one of the corners.

It will scarcely be necessary to follow Mr. Layard for the present in these labours. His own work must be consulted by those who desire to read the eloquent descriptions which this singularly gifted man has presented to the world. His style as a writer is always forcible, his language unadorned, and therefore all the more effective. He is necessarily the hero of his own tale, but he is most happy in keeping himself in the background, although no one can follow his narrative without being struck with the character of the man. He had an arduous task to perform. His difficulties were of the most varied nature, springing up oftentimes in quarters from which they were least expected. The obstacles encountered by the great Duke in the Peninsular campaign are well known. He had to deal with a faithless, treacherous people on the one hand, and a *parsimonious government* on the other. The dangers of war and the vicissitudes of climate were unimportant in comparison of the overwhelming re-

sponsibility of having to gain great ends with uncertain means, and to cope with untold obstacles amid circumstances which no amount of foresight could disentangle. The Assyrian traveller placed himself in a position which has its parallel with that of the peninsular hero, and like him he triumphed. We are inclined to apply to him Livy's oft-quoted portrait of Hannibal: '*Plurimum audaciæ ad pericula capessenda, plurimum consilii inter ipsa pericula erat; nullo labore aut corpus fatigari, aut animus vinci poterat. Caloris ac frigoris patientia par; cibi potionisque desiderio naturali non voluptate, modus finitus; vigiliarum somnique nec die, nec nocte, discriminata tempora. Id quod gerendis rebus superesset, quieti datum; ea neque molli strato neque silentio arcessita. Multi sæpe militari sagulo opertum, humi jacentem inter custodias stationesque militum, conspexerunt.*' Perhaps the most remarkable feature in Mr. Layard's operations was the ascendancy he was able to gain over the wild children of the desert. He studied thoroughly their habits and moods of mind, and by judicious treatment contrived not only to gain their co-operation, but even to enlist their enthusiasm in the work in which he was engaged. He proved himself excellent both as a diplomatist and a judge, ensuring himself in the one capacity from the incursions of neighbouring tribes, and in the other stilling the mutual jealousies of the motley group who were engaged in the excavations. The work extended over a period of about eighteen months, including intervals of interruption caused at one time by the jealous interference of the faithful at Mosul, at another by the extreme heat of the climate. It is much to be regretted that to the many unavoidable discouragements should have been added that of the slender support from England. M. Botta was more fortunate. The French government sent out to his assistance an artist well skilled in making drawings of the sculptures, and what was of no less importance, a well-stored exchequer. In the case of our own countryman, the more honour is due in proportion as the discouragements were greater. Indeed it is marvellous what he was able to accomplish. Bearing in mind how easy it would have been to have removed tons of rubbish without procuring a single alabaster slab; that in fact he had no plan supplied him by the Djin of this palace underground; that he laboured upon a shapeless heap, where no one had suspected the existence of more than confused fragments unworthy of antiquarian research; we cannot look at the plans of the north-west palace alone, and its twenty-eight chambers, without astonishment. The quadrangle at Somerset House will give an approximate idea of the extent of this erection. We must conceive its long galleries, corridors, its presence-chambers 150 feet in length, guarded

guarded at the entrance by colossal winged lions and bulls, and panelled with storied slabs, detailing the achievements of old Assyrian potentates.

Before leaving the banks of the Tigris, Mr. Layard made a partial investigation of the mounds at Kalah Shergat, situated about sixty miles from Mosul, on the right bank of the Tigris, and of Kouyunjik, the reputed site of Nineveh. The chief result of the first-mentioned was a sitting figure in black basalt, very much mutilated, which will be found in the British Museum. The principal mound at Kouyunjik has received the traditional title of Nebbi Yunus, or tomb of Jonah; with how much regard to truth or probability the reader may be left to conjecture. The point of importance in the Kouyunjik discoveries was the similarity observable between the architecture of its edifices and those of Nimroud and Khorsabad. The same long chambers predominated. Bas-reliefs there were, but larger in their dimensions than those of Nimroud. The winged, human-headed bulls forming the entrances, were from 14 to 16 feet square. Inscriptions were not numerous, and such as had survived the action of the intense heat which had assailed the building at its final destruction were with difficulty copied even in part.^m

It is of course impossible to attempt a detailed description here of the various sculptures which were brought to light in the course of all these excavations. As many of them have been safely deposited in the national collection, and still more have been engraved in the elaborate work entitled *Monuments of Nineveh*, the reader can be referred to those sources of information.

It now remains to glance at that view of the subject which is of most interest to ourselves—its relation to Scripture. To the candid mind these discoveries afford a new link in the great chain of indirect evidence of the truth of inspiration; we say indirect, for there is not much in these mysterious bas-reliefs that immediately coincides with the subjects of the Bible narrative. For example, we have as yet discovered no record of Jonah's mission, of the wars with Israel, of the captivity of the ten tribes, or even of the names of those kings who form what is termed conventionally the Scriptural dynasty. But it must be remembered that

^m A very great deal of Mr. Layard's arduous toil consisted in taking copies of bas-reliefs and inscriptions, and that without the primary advantage of an artist's education. We are inclined to wonder that he did not avail himself of the discoveries of M. Daguerre, or our countryman, Mr. Fox Talbot, as, with the help of a bright Assyrian sun, a few seconds would have sufficed to have transferred to an iodized plate or sheet of paper all the complexities of a cuneiform inscription, or the minutest intricacy of a royal vestment. It is to be acknowledged that he would have risked an accusation of sorcery, or have been told (as he was on another occasion) that the infidels were permitted to excel the faithful in worldly cunning now, in order that they might have their turn hereafter.

inscriptions innumerable await the learned leisure of Major Rawlinson, Dr. Hinckes, and others, who have, in spite of manifold obstacles, succeeded in extracting from characters previously unknown an equivalent meaning. Much sagacity has been brought to bear on the chronological question. But here Mr. Layard's own words may be adduced to show how far such labours have met with success:—

‘From our present limited knowledge of the character used in the inscriptions, and from a want of adequate acquaintance with the details of Assyrian art which might lead to a satisfactory classification of the various remains, we can scarcely aim at more than fixing a *comparative epoch* to these monuments. It would be hazardous to assign any positive date to them, or to ascribe their erection to any monarch whose name can be recognized in a dynastic list of acknowledged authenticity, and the time of whose reign can be determined with any pretence to accuracy. Although a conjecture may be allowed, we can come to no positive conclusion upon the subject.’^a

The first result which we may notice, and one of no small importance as an evidence of the truth of inspiration, is the *reality of Nineveh's existence*. There have not been wanting writers who were disposed to place the Assyrian history in the same category with that of early Rome or of the Argonauts. In their view it was fast receding into the dim regions of myth. And indeed historical tradition was not likely to be definite with regard to that city whose shapeless ruins met the eye of Xenophon. As our talented author remarks, ‘Nineveh was almost forgotten before history began.’ On this point Mr. Blackburn eloquently observes,—

‘For eight hundred years she was “forgotten, as a dead man out of mind,” so that the name of Nineveh does not occur again in the page of history till the second century of the Christian era; then Lucian, the Greek philosopher, only mentions the city to tell of its desolation. Born on the banks of the Euphrates, he more than once calls himself an Assyrian; and from his love of travel most probably was a witness of the fact he records, that “Nineveh hath so perished that no vestiges of it at present remaineth, nor can it be easily ascertained where formerly it stood.” The Mohammedan conquest spread the heavy pall of oblivion over its mouldering remains; and so completely was its name effaced from the earth, that men began to reckon its very existence a fable—one of the legends of an ignorant and credulous age.

‘But the hand of God has brought forth this most ancient city from her burying-place, to vindicate the truth of his own word, to reprove the historical scepticism of the present generation, and to read an impressive lesson to the nations of the earth.’^b

^a *Ninereh*, ii. 156.

^b *Rise and Ruin*, p. 220.

Nineveh, therefore, has a reality. The spades of Mr. Layard's Arabs have cleared for a time the halls of Sardanapalus. It was only a glimpse, however. It was found necessary, for the protection of those sculptures which could not be removed, that the grave of the 'bloody city' should once more be filled in. The grass and corn will yet wave where it has waved before, and scepticism may again be *credulous*, and be persuaded that no such city existed.

We have been assured, however, not only of the reality of the city and its position, but, as we may conjecture, of its *extent* also. We have already alluded to the similarity of the remains, architectural and artistic, of the three mounds, Khorsabad, Kouyunjik, and Nimroud. Now, these places stand at three of the corners of a trapezium, sixty miles in circuit. Take the ruins of Karamles near the great Zab, about a dozen miles from Nimroud, as the remaining corner, and the trapezium is mapped out in this once fertile plain, accurately described by the blasphemous Rabshakeh, an inhabitant of that country, as 'a land of corn and wine, a land of bread and vineyards, a land of oil olive and of honey.' It would not at once be intelligible how this large tract should be coincident with the former site of the Assyrian metropolis. London, as defined by the boundaries of its parliamentary boroughs, does not cover one fourth of the space. Moreover, if we take the sixty thousand persons in Nineveh, who in the days of the prophet Jonah 'did not know their right hand from the left,' as the infantine section of a population of three hundred thousand, the discrepancy in the comparison will be yet more striking. But all this enables us to realize the remarkable description in Jonah ii. 3, 4: 'Nineveh was an *exceeding great city*, of three days' journey. And Jonah began to enter into the city, a *day's journey*.' Consequently, Nineveh was a collection of scattered houses, interspersed with green pastures or fruitful vineyards. Its population of five times three score thousand persons were not confined in the narrow streets of a European fortified town, nor were 'much cattle' tortured into the limits of a narrow market. The king's palace had its park stocked with game and animals of the chase, and this, together with the pasture grounds and vineyards, would be included within the city walls sixty miles in circuit. Some of the battle scenes, brought from Nimroud, exhibit a solitary palm-tree within the walls of a besieged city. It is reasonable to consider such a feature as a conventional representation of acres of wood. The warriors, be it observed, are full-sized, half the height of the walls, or even more. Now, the walls of these old cities are recorded as having been seventy cubits high; therefore, making the same allowance for the trees

as we are compelled to do for the fortifications, we shall gather a notion of the vast extent and varied appearance of the city to which Jonah was sent. How this extent of wall was to be manned in a siege, we might be at a loss to conjecture. But a glance at the sculptures will show that the besiegers were not possessed of the destructive means and appliances of modern warfare. The battering-ram, depicted as it is with life-like accuracy, and the moveable fort, gave the assailants but a limited advantage in attacking walls of seventy cubits in height. The small population might, therefore, trust to the solid structure and height of the walls, although their vast circuit would, in our view, be an element of weakness. It would appear that within the area indicated by the four boundary marks already mentioned, there are many large mounds, including the principal ruins in Assyria, such as Karakush, Baasheikha, Brazain, Hussein, Fel-Yara, &c., &c.; and that the face of the country is strewn with the remains of pottery, bricks, and other fragments.

As we have alluded to the name of Jonah in connection with the vast size of this ancient city, we will not proceed to another topic without first introducing to our readers Mr. Blackburn's ingenious, and at the same time eloquent, description of Jonah's admission to the presence-chamber of the Assyrian monarch. To those who are familiar with the Nimroud marbles, there will appear no exaggeration or any over-fanciful additions.

It is plain, from the sculptures, that the king of Assyria was approached, like all Oriental princes, with such tokens of profound reverence, as, in fact, amounted to religious adoration. Seated on his throne of state, his ministers, eunuchs, and other great officers, stood around him with folded hands and downcast eyes, whilst those who were brought before him, forgetting the erect dignity of human nature, prostrated themselves in the most abject manner at his feet. Imagine Jonah introduced into the royal palace, and you will see that the scene and circumstances must have sorely tried his faith and steadfastness. As he passed along the lengthened corridors towards the hall of audience, he must have been struck with the air of uncommon splendour which surrounded him. On the walls he beheld the sculptured figures of priests and eunuchs, of kings, heroes, and ministers of state, of genii and idol gods, of battle and hunting scenes, all elaborately and gorgeously coloured; whilst there stood, at the angles of the passages, colossal statues of strange winged compound creatures, like the guardian spirits of the place.^p

The discoveries of Mr. Layard have also established the *anti-*

^p *Rise and Ruin*, p. 76.

quity of Nineveh, as in perfect agreement with the statements of Scripture. It has been seen already, that to the remains of the buildings may be assigned 'comparative' dates. There is every appearance to justify the supposition of the lapse of several centuries between the rise of the earliest edifices and the final destruction of the city, which we know took place B.C. 606. In other words, these shapeless mounds contain within them evidence of the existence of a powerful military state, which, from the banks of the Tigris, was possessed of means in the days of the Judges, or even in those of Abraham, of sending formidable armies as far west as Syria or Palestine. The wars between Othniel and Chushan-rishathaim are briefly narrated (Judges iii. 8); but a state of subjection extending over eight years, with a subsequent deliverance, were momentous events to the nation of Israel—events in which we may fairly presume Nineveh to have taken a leading part. Amraphel, king of Shinar, mentioned Genesis xiv., cannot be so satisfactorily identified as one of the successors of Ninus. Nevertheless, there is nothing in such a supposition at all at variance with the facts which are now plainly submitted to our notice.

The sculptures enable us to form a very vivid conception of the *military* system of the Assyrians, and thereby illustrate, in a striking manner, various passages of holy writ. These illustrations are, of course, of a general character. They show the nature of Oriental warfare at that period of which the Old Testament Scriptures mainly treat. We cannot, it is true, say *what* 'fenced cities' are depicted—what particular pages the artist has intended to represent. We cannot say that this procession of captives numbers in its ranks the conquered of Samaria, or that that captive monarch is the unhappy Hoshea, son of Elah, just as we cannot identify every 'chief of eunuchs' with Rabsaris, or every 'chief cup-bearer' with Rabshakeh, such being the offices which these Assyrian names imply, and of which the sculptures give ample illustration. But that which illustrates Assyrian warfare in particular must of necessity include many features in common with that of surrounding peoples. In no species of art do nations so rapidly instruct each other as in the *ars militaris*. Napoleon, whilst he was acting as the conqueror of Europe, was in the most effectual manner giving strategetical instruction. Never was a more universal military reformer than he. Our own system in the field is borrowed from our neighbours; of which our technicalities are sufficient proof. Can any term or title be pointed out in regimental discipline or field tactics, in fortification or siege, or even in arms and accoutrements, which is of English origin? Will not more than half of them be found *ad litteram* in
in

in a French dictionary? It is, therefore, probable enough that the Jews acquired their military ideas partly from Egypt, but in a great measure from Assyria. This consideration adds materially to the value of the Nineveh bas-reliefs.

There are passages, however, which directly describe Assyrian warriors, and these have ample and immediate confirmation in the sculptures. The prophet Nahum, whose prophecy is the 'burden of Nineveh,' gives this glowing description (Nahum iii. 2, 3): 'Woe to the bloody city! it is all full of lies and robbery; the prey departeth not. The noise of a whip, and the noise of the rattling of the wheels, and of the prancing horses, and of the jumping chariots. The horseman lifteth up both the bright sword and the glittering spear; and there is a multitude of slain, and a great number of carcases; and there is none end of their corpses; they stumble upon their corpses.' Throughout the various battle-scenes which have been preserved, cavalry and chariots form a most conspicuous feature. It is evident that those well-watered plains which stretched from the Tigris to the Euphrates, afforded pasture to a fine breed of horses, which were made available for warlike purposes. 'No one,' says Mr. L., 'can look at the horses of the early Assyrian sculptures, without being convinced that they were drawn from the finest models. The head is small and well shaped, the nostrils large and high, the neck arched, the body long, and the legs slender and sinewy.' In a stirring passage of the prophet Habakkuk, the Assyrian cavalry is made their most terrible characteristic: 'Lo, I raise up the Chaldeans, that bitter and hasty nation, which shall march through the breadth of the land, to possess the dwelling-places that are not theirs. They are terrible and dreadful: their judgment and their dignity shall proceed of themselves. Their horses also are swifter than the leopards, and are more fierce than the evening wolves; and their horsemen shall spread themselves, and their horsemen shall come from far; they shall fly as the eagle that hasteth to eat' (Hab. i. 6-8). These horses, whether used in chariots or for the mounted warriors, appear in the sculptures with the most elaborate ornaments, the former being more conspicuous in this respect, probably on account of the superior rank of those privileged to use them for that purpose. The head-stall was surmounted by an arched crest, and round the neck was an embroidered collar ending in a rich tassel or bell, thus illustrating the allusion (Zech. xiv. 20) to the 'bells for the horses.' 'Clothes for chariots' are enumerated (Ezek. xxvii. 20) as part of the merchandise in which Tyre was accustomed to trade. This is a sufficient explanation of the sackcloth for 'man and beast,' which the repentant king of Nineveh commanded. The embroidered
clothes,

clothes, to which these were a substitute, were frequently thrown over the backs of the chariot-horses, and almost covered the body from the ears to the tail.

The 37th chapter of Isaiah, which contains the prophecy made with regard to the army of Sennacherib, has various allusions to the modes of warfare which that general was attempting to employ against the Jewish nation: 'By thy servants hast thou reproached the Lord, and hast said, By the multitude of my chariots am I come up to the height of the mountains, to the sides of Lebanon; and I will cut down the tall cedars thereof, and the choice fir-trees thereof.' The devastation inflicted by an invading army is illustrated by the sculptures in exact agreement with this vain-glorious boasting of theirs. The chariots have been already spoken of; we may add also, that the mode of conducting a siege is depicted with great accuracy. Lofty towers are represented, the tops of which were on a level with the wall of the besieged city, enabling the warriors to '*board* the enemy.' Where the wall was erected on an artificial mound, or where there were ditches or other inequalities of surface which prevented the approach of the moveable tower, the expedient was adopted of making an inclined embankment, along which the tower could be dragged. In these operations, the warriors are represented as protecting themselves by large wicker-work shields from the missiles which the besieged threw down from the summit of the wall. This makes the threat (ver. 33) very intelligible: 'Thus saith the Lord concerning the king of Assyria, He shall not come into this city, nor shoot an arrow there, nor *come before it with shields, nor cast a bank against it.*' In the 29th verse a mode of punishment was threatened, which they have in their own sculptures recorded as adopted by themselves with captives: 'Because thy rage against me, and thy tumult, is come up into mine ears, therefore will I put; *my hook in thy nose, and my bridle in thy lips, and I will turn thee back by the way by which thou camest.*' This is illustrated by a bas-relief from Khorsabad, where captives are led before the king by a rope fastened to rings passed through the lip and nose. Mr. Blackburn suggests that the obscure allusion (Amos iv. 2) admits of the same explanation: 'He will take you away with hooks, and your posterity with fish-hooks.' But as this is addressed to the *kine* of Bashan, it is scarcely necessary to look for an explanation to practices more remote than what are adopted among ourselves. We have most of us seen a bull led along the streets by a nose-ring and chain; but it is even possible that nothing more is meant by fish-hooks than common goads.

There are many other features of oriental warfare of that early period

period which are amply illustrated in the Nimroud sculptures, all of which harmonize with the Scriptural allusions. The same may be said of *social* and *domestic* institutions which are incidentally embodied in these remains. The reader may be referred to Mr. Layard's acute dissertations on these subjects, where also he will enjoy the additional help of accurately-engraved illustrations. Indeed, many of the nicer points of correspondence turn on minute representations, which can only be appreciated by seeing them either in the original or where the artist has made a faithful copy. To attempt a verbal description would in such cases be all but useless. We may add, that Mr. Blackburn has most industriously, and with a discerning eye, gathered together all that throws light upon Scripture: he has, in more than one sense, left no stone unturned.

One passage of Scripture (Ezek. xxiii. 14, 15) stands prominently forward from the circumstance of containing an accurate description of these very sculptures: Mr. Layard has indeed inscribed it upon his title-page. We quote from his own comments:—

‘The passage in Ezekiel, describing the interior of the Assyrian palaces, so completely corresponds with, and illustrates, the monuments of Nimroud and Khorsabad that it deserves particular notice. The prophet, in typifying the corruptions which had crept into the religious system of the Jews, and the idolatrous practices borrowed from nations with whom they had been brought into contact, thus illustrates the influence of the Assyrians. “She saw men pourtrayed upon the wall, the images of the Chaldeans pourtrayed with vermilion, girded with girdles upon their loins, exceeding in dyed attire upon their heads, all of them princes to look to, after the manner of the Babylonians of Chaldea, the land of their nativity.” He adds the following more literal translation:—“She saw men of sculptured (or painted) *workmanship* upon the wall, likenesses of the Chaldeans, pictured or (sculptured) in shashar, girded with girdles on their loins, with coloured flowing *head-dresses* upon their heads, *with the* aspect of princes all of them, the likeness of the sons of Babel-Chaldea, the land of their captivity.”^p Ezekiel, it will be remembered, prophesied on the banks of the Chebar, a river which, whether it can be identified with the Khabour of the Arabs (the Chaboras of the Greeks), flowing through the plains of Mesopotamia, and flowing into the Euphrates near Karkemish (Circesium), or with another of the same name rising in the mountains of Kurdistan, and joining the Tigris above Mosul, was certainly in the immediate vicinity of Nineveh. In the passage quoted, the prophet is referring to a period previous to the final destruction of the Assyrian capital, an event which he most probably witnessed, as the date usually assigned to his prophecies is 593 B.C., only thirteen

^p The words in italics are not in the text.

years after the Medo-Babylonian conquest. There can scarcely be a doubt that he had seen the objects which he describes—the figures sculptured upon the walls and painted. The prevalence of a red colour, shown by the Khorsabad remains, and the elaborate and highly-ornamented head-dress of Khorsabad and Kouyunjik kings, are evidently indicated.’¹

We may well say that the labours of the accomplished man who has exhibited old Nineveh to the world would have served a high end if only to illustrate these two verses of Ezekiel. If no other passages could be found containing allusions to which these sculptures corresponded, the light thrown upon this one would be a glorious result. It is just one of those incidental pieces of evidence which confirm the truth of entire books of inspiration. The prophet on the banks of the Chebar speaks intelligibly to us; the captivity which compelled him to exchange the Jordan for the Tigris is made a palpable fact. The tablets, moreover, being themselves *histories*, carry us back to the early deeds of a great nation, and that nation is recorded in holy writ as the first of empires, and the rod of God’s anger by which he chastened his chosen people. Mr. Layard has, in fact, inscribed his own name in every future commentary upon the Word of God. All our domestic Bibles, Scott, Henry, Louth, Mant, &c., must open their paragraphs for the insertion of his indispensable scholia.

One topic connected with these discoveries yet remains, on which we cannot refrain from making some comments. It arises out of the remarkable points of resemblance observable between the symbolical figures described by the old prophets and certain of the compound animals and other forms which are to be found among the sculptures. Mr. Layard lays particular stress upon the winged figure in a circle, termed the *ferouher*, which is generally represented hovering over the king. If the king is at war, this figure will be seen in the act of discharging an arrow; if the king is surrounded by his courtiers, the *ferouher* is in a less

¹ Layard, vol. ii. 309. The very striking correspondence which Mr. Layard observes between the Khorsabad alabasters and the description in Ezekiel did not escape the notice of our talented countryman Mr. Armitage, who in his splendid picture of ‘Aholibah,’ which appeared in the exhibition of the Academy during the season of 1850, embodied most vividly the conception of the prophet. The painter carries us back over the gulf of time, and shows us the barbaric splendour of an Assyrian palace. Judah, as the mystical Aholibah, accompanied by her sister Aholah, is represented in profound contemplation of the recorded deeds of the royal Assyrian youth. The *infatuated* expression of this unhappy votary of forbidden idolatries is given with a truthfulness from which we almost recoil. The last remains of ennobling sentiment seemed to be disappearing from a countenance originally capable of expressing high thought, and a substitution is being made of that which indicates an entire prostration of the soul. The picture is an intense realization, aided by the accessories of powerful drawing, breadth of colour, and masterly handling, in every respect.

warlike attitude. In fact, he manifests a sympathy in whatever the king may be occupied, and is an obvious index of the royal mind: it is intelligible enough that he is the guardian angel, in short, a symbol of the unseen deity. This emblem, moreover, does not always preserve the form of a winged figure in a circle, but sometimes assumes that of a winged globe, wheel, or disk, either plain or ornamented with leaves like a flower. It is to be noticed also that this symbol appeared on the same walls with the compound animals—men with the faces of eagles, oxen and lions with the faces of men, figures with two wings and figures with four wings. The vermillion, too, must be recalled to mind, as also the probability that the sculptures may have been originally more or less gilded. With these images impressed on the mind's eye we turn to the visions of Ezekiel. He describes the 'likeness of four living creatures;' 'they sparkled like the colour of burnished brass;' 'and they had the hands of a man under their wings on their four sides; and they four had their faces and their wings: their faces were those of a man, a lion, an ox, and an eagle.' The prophet then describes what corresponds so closely to the Assyrian emblem: 'Their appearance and their work was as it were *a wheel in the middle of a wheel.*' The peculiar manner also in which the winged circle is represented in the sculptures as hovering over the king, has its resemblance in the vision: 'When the living creatures went, the wheels went by them; and when the living creatures were lifted up from the earth, *the wheels were lifted up.*'

These coincidences, says Mr. Layard, are too marked not to deserve notice, and do certainly lead to the inference that the symbols *chosen by the prophet* were derived from the Assyrian sculptures. Mr. Blackburn does not, in express terms, repudiate this inference, though he transfers the passage to his text. With him, we should be disposed to think that the idea of compound animals is not originally Assyrian. The cherubim of the tabernacle and the living creatures or beasts (Rev. iv. 7) of the Apocalypse were compounded of the same animals. When we remember also that cherubim were placed at the garden of Eden to keep the way of the tree of life, it is reasonable to suppose that they exhibited the same compound forms. This identity had occurred to ourselves before seeing Mr. Blackburn's quotation from Rosenmüller, which we now repeat:—

'The cherubim were fictitious animals, compounded of a man, a lion, an ox, and an eagle, as described in Ezek. i. 6, et seq. It is stated (Gen. iii. 24) that they were placed by God as the guards of paradise. Hence the cherubim came to be symbols of sacred things and places, which it was not lawful to approach. The sphinxes of the Egyptians,

Egyptians, the dragons of the Greeks, and the griffins of the Indians and northern nations of Asia, are similar, both in form and signification, to the cherubim of the Hebrews: for they, also, are described as fictitious winged creatures, compounded from various animals, and guardians of things or places to which access was forbidden. Great wisdom was frequently ascribed to them, and this was especially the case with regard to sphinxes, animals having the face of a man, the body of a lion or ox, and the wings of an eagle.*

It is very remarkable that the four beasts (*τεσσαρα ζῶα*) of the Apocalypse join with the elders in the song of praise to the Lamb (Rev. v. 9). 'Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof; for thou wast slain and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation.' This implies that the cherubim typified the redeemed church. It also makes it yet more evident that compound animals represented the perfection of harmonious attributes. The strength of the lion, the patience of the ox, the intelligence of the man, and the soaring of the eagle, form, in combination, an ideal excellence which the poet would scarcely be able to exceed.†

We think we are justified in saying that the Assyrian sculptures do not account for Ezekiel's emblems, although they are wonderful illustrations. We have a general coincidence between the compound animals of the tabernacle of Ezekiel and St. John. It is acknowledged that Moses had seen the same emblems in Egypt, and Ezekiel in Nineveh. Admitting, for the sake of argument, that the prophet and the lawgiver both copied from the heathen nations among which they respectively sojourned, the question remains, Did Assyria copy from Egypt, or Egypt from Assyria? or was there a common type from which all derived the conception?

One of the visions of Daniel is even more strikingly illustrated by the sculptures than those of Ezekiel. It is that of the four beasts in the seventh chapter. 'The first was like a lion, and had eagle's wings; I beheld till the wings thereof were plucked, and it was lifted up from the earth, and made stand upon the feet as a man, and a man's heart was given to it' (ver. 4). If for the *unseen* appendage of a man's heart we substitute that which is more capable of expression by stone and chisel, a man's head, we have an exact description of what may be seen in the British Museum standing in colossal dignity—a winged human-headed

* *Rise and Fall* (note), p. 172.

† It is strange that Roman Catholic expositors, and stranger still that Protestant glass-stainers, should have distributed those symbols among the four evangelists, assigning to Matthew the man, to Mark the lion, to Luke the calf, and to John the eagle. This fanciful exegesis on the windows of our churches does not help forward the cause of Biblical criticism.

lion. The coincidence is yet more remarkable, when it is taken into account that this animal in Daniel's vision is interpreted as the first of the four empires, and is undoubtedly the symbol of that very kingdom whose original metropolis was Nineveh, namely, the Assyrian. The correspondence did not escape the penetrating eye of Bishop Newton, who remarks, in connection with Daniel's vision, that winged lions had been seen at Persepolis. The Bishop's explanation of this part of Daniel's vision we subjoin :—

' This is the kingdom of the Babylonians ; and the king of Babylon is in like manner compared to a lion by Jeremiah (iv. 7). " The lion is come up from his thicket, and the destroyer of the Gentiles is in his way," and he is said to fly as an eagle (xlviii. 40). " Behold he shall fly as an eagle, and shall spread his wings over Moab ;" and he is also compared to an eagle by Ezekiel (xvii. 3 and 12). " Thus saith the Lord God, a great eagle with great wings," &c.'

It is evident, from the positions in which the winged lions and bulls were discovered, that they were not objects of idolatrous worship, but rather heraldic symbols (as we may fairly presume) of the empire. Mr. Blackburn thus describes the purpose to which these colossal images were applied.

' To the sacred hall at Nineveh there were four entrances ; one the grand western entrance, two on the north, and one on the south side. These approaches were all guarded by pairs of colossal figures, one in each corner, which formed a most imposing and magnificent entrance. Those at the western or chief entrance were human-headed winged lions, the human shape being continued down to the waist, and furnished with arms. They were about twelve feet in height, and the same in length. Expanded wings spring from the shoulders, and spread over the back. The single entrance on the south was guarded by winged human-headed bulls, whilst the two door-ways on the north were both guarded by winged lions with the heads of men, and with human arms ; in one case having the hands crossed in front, and in the other carrying a stag or ram on one arm, and holding a branch with three flowers in the other hand.'

If this compound animal was the adopted symbol of the empire, an heraldic emblem, and not a ' God,' it is worthy of notice that our own British *lion* is an heraldic emblem not dissimilar. We are not indisposed, as a nation, to recognize our own qualities in those symbolized by the lion. We confess, however, that the addition of the human head and eagle's wings would include moral attributes to which we should gladly lay claim. We have also unconsciously followed Assyrian example in the use of these colossal figures. If the Holyhead Railway is ever buried under the sand of the desert some future Layard will find pairs of co-

¹ *Rise and Ruin*, p. 177.

lossal lions keeping their silent watch, and giving to the excavator of that day a harder task to effect their removal than was experienced with any that were found at Nimroud or Kouyunjik. The couchant lions at the Britannia Tube have an office not unlike that of their predecessors in the East. Perhaps it may be suggested that as they watch over the most stupendous result of British engineering skill, human heads might have been given them, and as the swift train and the still swifter electric message hurry past them, an addition might be made of eagles' wings to typify the country which gave birth to these inventions. We should then fully attain to the Assyrian model.

It would appear, therefore, that when Daniel prophesied of the four great empires, the Assyrian or Babylonian, the Medo-Persian, the Macedonian, and the Roman, he described the first under a symbol which had probably been adopted by the nation itself, and embodied in sculptures which he saw during the captivity.

Our readers will be well aware that the discussion of these points of correspondence suggests certain questions of considerable difficulty with regard to the inspiration of the writers of Scripture. Were they at liberty to apply the inventions of the heathen around them to express the divine message with which they were commissioned? It is still more mysterious when we turn to the furniture of the Jewish Temple, or (to use the term applied to it in the Epistle to the Hebrews) to 'the patterns of things in the heavens,' and find ornaments and devices corresponding to what had been adopted by the idol-worshippers. But an explanation may be given which leaves untouched the question of the writer's inspiration. The nature of Biblical language must always have been determined by the reader's comprehension. That which is intelligible to us is not the language of angels, but the language of men. When the divine utterances (קול יהוה) were given, they only expressed that to which man could listen. Hence the sacred writers everywhere make use of the ideas current amongst those to whom they addressed themselves; and we in our age and country are compelled to call in heathen antiquities to throw light on the Sacred Volume. The Olympic games, the accoutrements of a Roman warrior, the 'length, and breadth, and depth, and height' of Diana's Temple, are sources from which we gather comments on St. Paul's Epistles. And if, on the interior of Egyptian temples, or on the walls of Assyrian palaces, we find similar points of correspondence with the visions of Moses and Ezekiel, we do not thereby weaken in the slightest degree their claims to inspiration.

We now take leave of this subject. We look forward with interest to the discoveries that may yet be made, not only in the mounds of Nimroud, or Kalah Sherghat, but in the sculptures themselves, that invite examination within the walls of our National Museum. The Scriptural investigation of Assyrian antiquity will yet supply labour for the theologian. Mr. Layard has done something, and his Scriptural studies, being the work of a man not a professed scholar, may be regarded as a monument of patient thought. Mr. Blackburn's book is by no means an epitome of Mr. Layard's; it has quite a value of its own, and will be read with greatest interest by those who are already familiar with the larger volumes. We hope that Biblical investigators will direct their attention to the subject. Indeed we are sure that the growing interest in this most wonderful discovery of an age of wonders will find vocal expression in a work adequate to its importance.

C. D.

THE JANSENISTS, AND THEIR REMNANT IN HOLLAND.

A CHAPTER IN CHURCH HISTORY.

'The curse causeless shall not come.'—*Prov. xxvi. 2.*

§ I.—JANSENISM: ITS RISE AND SUFFERINGS.

THE acquaintance which many Protestants have with Church History seems to cease at the Reformation; and this is the case even when they have some general knowledge of the events of that era, and of the principal features of preceding ages. Since the Reformation, Protestants have too exclusively attended to the annals of Protestantism (as though it were co-extensive with Christendom), and too often their sphere of information goes but little beyond the circle of that particular body to which, as individuals, they may belong.

It is as though a mighty stream had been traced downward from its source for many a mile, with every object on its banks exciting new interests; but, at length, when the same river has been divided, so as to form a separate and smoother channel, the attention was fixed on that only, utterly forgetful of the course in which the mass of the waters flows onward. We may prize the Reformation as highly as we will; we may render humble
and

and reverential thanks for the mercy then shown, in bringing out into full light the cardinal doctrine of *justification through faith*; we may value the unhindered use of God's holy word; but still we have not so to think of our privileges as to forget Christendom at large—we have not to shut our eyes to the measure of light and truth vouchsafed to those in ostensible fellowship with Rome, and thus to overlook the struggles which have hence arisen within that body, from which the Reformation happily freed us.

There are also not a few who, having some acquaintance with the sufferings and testimony borne by Port Royal, look with feelings of love and sympathy on the Jansenists of the seventeenth century, but who are wholly unconscious that Jansenists are still to be found, and that their struggle with Papal authority and Jesuitical arts is still continued in our own days.

The writings of St. Augustine exercised a permanent influence in the Latin Church. They were but partially understood, it is true; but still the doctrines on the subjects of grace and election laid down by that father, were by no means forgotten. From the time of Thomas Aquinas, the real or supposed doctrines of St. Augustine were considered as a peculiar deposit of the Dominican order of monks, to which Thomas had belonged.

In the Church of Rome, such a thought was not entertained as that of *contradicting* what St. Augustine had written. The sentiments, however, which actually ruled in men's minds, and the religious system to which they belonged, were virtual contradictions to every *real* apprehension of grace.

The bringing in of light shows the true condition of the objects on which it falls; and thus the *actual* doctrinal state of Romanism was only exhibited, when *the justification of a sinner through faith in the one finished sacrifice of Christ*, was definitely and fully preached. This was a thing wholly different from any mere opinions on the subject of grace. But this introduction of truth soon led to a more concrete form being assumed by error.

In vain did some in the Church of Rome maintain that nothing could stop the spread of Lutheranism except firm opposition to Pelagian error, by the full statement of the grace of God, and the merits of Christ, as the alone ground of our acceptance. Opposition to the Reformation soon led to a denial of every truth on which it was based.

The order of the Jesuits arose; the council of Trent was convened; and then the full opposition which the true statement of the gospel of Christ had excited was brought out to light. '*Justification through faith*' was there opposed by *one* especially, who possessed no common power of moulding and training the minds of others. This man was Lainez the Jesuit; one of the

three who commenced that order, and who subsequently succeeded Ignatius as its second general.

While Loyola takes the place of founder of the 'Society of Jesus,' and while Francis Xavier gave it a *prestige* by his enthusiastic labours in the east, it was Lainez who gave the institute its tone and direction. To him, more than to any other, should we attribute the character and principles which we associate with the name of Jesuitism.^a

At Trent there were some true advocates for the gospel of Christ: the Archbishop of Sienna, two bishops, and five others, ascribed *justification simply and solely to the merits of Christ through faith*. Cardinal Pole, one of the presiding legates of Paul III. at the council, entreated those assembled not to reject a doctrine simply because it was held by Luther. Various modifications were proposed; but the view of the Jesuits, as set forth by Salmeron, and especially by Lainez, principally prevailed in causing the adoption of the Tridentine canons and anathemas.^b And yet those who held the doctrines of grace were neither *convinced* nor silenced. They immediately began to explain the decrees in such a way as not to contradict St. Augustine! In doing this, they caused the decrees to contradict themselves!

Ignatius Loyola had prescribed Thomas Aquinas as an author to be studied in certain parts of the training of the Jesuits, unless some other work might appear more suitable to the times. Acquaviva, the fifth general of the order, took advantage of the proviso, so as to recommend a new 'order of study' suited to the Pelagian doctrines which now prevailed in that body; in this he acted on a plan proposed by Lainez. Thus had the order *immediately* departed from the Thomistic ideas of its founder.

But this was only a step. In 1588, Molina^c took up the questions of *grace* and *free-will*, and carried his views to the very utmost length. He taught that 'free-will, *without the aid of grace*, can produce morally good works; that it can withstand temptation; that it can even elevate itself to this and the other acts of hope, faith, love, and repentance. When a man has ad-

^a Anti-Jesuit writers in the Church of Rome have fully recognized this: they have even interpreted Rev. ix. 1, as if Lainez were the fallen star who let loose the scorpion-locusts—the Jesuits. This *strange* and *guess-work* exposition shows at least the feelings of those who advance it.

^b No one need be surprised that Cardinal Pole and the Archbishop of Sienna both left the Council, and did not return.

^c Not to be confounded (as has sometimes been done) with Michael de Molinos, the Quietist, a century later.

vanced thus far, God *then* bestows grace upon him on account of Christ's merits, by means of which grace he experiences the supernatural effects of sanctification ; yet, as before this grace had been received, so still free-will always holds a *determining* place.' Man thus begins a work, which God afterwards continues by man's assistance. Such was the doctrinal system of the Molinists ; of course, nothing which ascribed *election* to God, or that taught *His* prevenient grace, could stand with such a system. The Dominicans were alarmed ; a disputation was at length held, and the Inquisition interfered, bringing the charge of heresy against most of the order of Jesuits.

At this crisis the general, Acquaviva, had the address to remove the cause pending between the Dominicans and his own order to Rome for decision. This was in 1596 ; the Pope, Clement VIII., took a warm interest in the theological points involved in the discussion. Sixty-five meetings and thirty-seven disputations were held on the subject in his presence ; he wrote much on the question himself, and he appears to have been an upholder of the doctrines of grace and predestination taught by the Dominicans.⁴ But he put off his definitive decision. This was induced by many causes ; he did not wish to daunt the ardour of the Jesuits, then the best upholders of the Papacy. In this dispute they even threatened the Pope. The cause of the Jesuits was also upheld by Henry IV. of France, who had again received them into that country. But, perhaps, the zeal of Cardinal du Perron principally prevented a judgment being given against the Jesuits ; he told the Pope that even a Protestant might subscribe the doctrines of the Dominicans.

In 1605 Paul V. became Pope. From September in that year to the following February, seventeen meetings were held in his presence on the disputed doctrines ; his judgment was decidedly against the Jesuits, so that in October and November, 1606, it was deliberated in what precise form the Molinist doctrine should be condemned. And yet no condemnation was passed. The Jesuits, at this juncture, showed their devotion in submitting to expulsion from Venice rather than compromise the Papal claims ; and the desire not to offend *them* was felt to be of more importance to Rome than was the maintenance of truth ! On August 29, 1607, the contending parties were dismissed : it was an-

⁴ The Pope thus expressed himself : ' God forms in us the motion of our will and effectively disposes our heart, by the dominion which his supreme majesty has over the wills of men as well as over the rest of the creatures which are under heaven, according to St. Augustin.'

nounced that the decision would be published at *the proper time*; meanwhile, neither party was to malign the other. The 'proper time' has not yet arrived, so that the Papal decision is yet amongst things to be waited for. The Bull 'Unigenitus' may, however, be regarded as taking the place of a formal decision.

This was a triumph for the Jesuits; the doctrines of Molina had not been condemned, and of this they made good use. They employed them skilfully against Protestantism, showing, as well they might, how opposed *these* views are to that doctrine of the Reformation, that we can do no good works acceptable to God without the grace of God by Christ preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us when we have that good will.

Many hearts still clung to the writings of St. Augustine: such naturally shrunk from the increasing influence of the Jesuits. It seemed as though some definite step alone were wanting to array many in doctrinal opposition to the inroads made on truth. This it was that gave such importance to the publication of the 'Augustinus' of Cornelius Jansenius, Bishop of Ypres. Jansenius had been a student at Louvain, either *with* Jean Baptist du Vergier de Hauranne (best known by the name of the abbacy which he afterwards held, St. Cyran), or else immediately after him, and in that place they saw and felt the evil workings of the Jesuits; they marked the inroads which that system was making on all doctrinal truth and practical morality. Subsequently, they remained together for six years at Bayonne, and made the writings of St. Augustine their principal study.

From this time it was the business of Jansenius's life to arrange and methodize everything in the writings of St. Augustine on the subjects of the grace of God, the condition of man as fallen, free-will and human impotence, original sin, election, efficacious grace, faith, and other points. He thus sought to meet the increasing Pelagianism, by opposing to it the authority of one whom the Papacy owned in word, at least, as one of the 'Doctors of the Church.'

Thus was he employed for many years. In 1636 he was consecrated Bishop of Ypres; and on the 6th of May, 1638, he died of the plague in his fifty-third year, after having declared in writing that he submitted his scarcely-finished work to the judgment of the then Pope, Urban VIII.

His friends, however, made preparations for publishing his 'Augustinus,' without waiting on the procrastinations of the Roman court: indeed, it was needful for them to be prompt, for the Jesuits were already on the alert to cause the suppression of the work. The 'Augustinus,' which first appeared at Louvain
in

in 1640, was hailed by many ; for there were many who, though within the pale of Rome, sighed for something of real spirituality in religion. Those who felt their own impotence, found in the doctrines of the grace of God, even when partially and imperfectly apprehended, a reality such as no forms of Romish observance could supply.

The Jesuits had gone on in their course with increased activity and power : to consolidate their influence, they set forth the most lax systems of casuistry ; in reading them, it is difficult to believe that they are the productions of any who have borne the name of Christians. The exculpatory considerations by which they sought to deaden conscience, are almost inconceivable. They had introduced themselves everywhere as confessors, and they gained not a little influence by softening all ideas of guilt, and excluding the necessity of real repentance before God as a prerequisite to absolution.

Of course, the Jesuits, and those guided by them, must have abhorred all who taught and held the necessity of 'repentance towards God and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ,' or who maintained Christian doctrines on the subjects of sin and holiness. M. de St. Cyran was at this time, probably, more the object of their enmity than any other individual in France. He had diffused around a mild light, and many had learned from his lips something of the preciousness of Christ, while they observed him to be, indeed, one who lived and acted in the fear of God.

There was an institution with which M. de St. Cyran was connected, in which the doctrines inculcated by him had long been received and cherished. This was the celebrated abbey of Port Royal. Angelique Arnauld had been appointed abbess in 1602, at the age of eleven years. The abbey was in a state of lax discipline, and the appointment of an abbess at such an age, and the deception practised on the Pope, to whom it was certified, by the relations of the young abbess, that she was seventeen, do not indicate a high standard of ecclesiastical morality at that time amongst the French Roman Catholics. The authorities of the Church were conniving parties to the imposition as to the abbess's age.

Father Basil, a Capuchin monk, who had learned the truth of the gospel of Christ, and had resolved formally to quit the communion of Rome, passed by Port Royal. This was March 25th, 1608. He was permitted to preach, and the seed thus sown was not in vain : that one sermon brought forth fruit. There were hearts in Port Royal from that day that loved the Gospel of Christ. Basil, like Philip the Evangelist (Acts viii.), 'saw no more' on earth those who had heard the word of God from

from his lips : he became a Protestant, but his work was owned of God, and accompanied by the life-giving power of the Holy Ghost. How wondrous are God's ways when He acts in grace ! *

The Mère Angelique felt herself bound in conscience to enforce the rule of the order into which she had been so strangely introduced, and her success caused her labours to extend to other houses besides her own.

M. de St. Cyran was introduced to the Abbess of Port Royal through some opposition which had been raised to a book of devotions for private use, circulated by some connected with that abbey. This tract, which had been surreptitiously obtained from its author, was vehemently condemned in a pamphlet by the Archbishop of Sens. The little book of devotions was patronized by Zamet, Bishop of Langres. M. de St. Cyran, who was not acquainted with either party, examined the censured pamphlet ; and he saw that, although the expressions were sometimes unguarded and capable of a bad construction, yet that the tone of thought which ran through it was simply that of piety. This (he considered) decided its true character. The Archbishop of Sens, in writing against it, had (in his opinion) written against piety of feeling itself. M. de St. Cyran therefore wrote in its favour, showing that he knew how to distinguish between the general principles on which a work is written and casual expressions which may occur in it.† Soon after this defence of the condemned book of private devotions, M. de St. Cyran became the spiritual director of Port Royal.

While the nuns of that abbey removed to Port Royal de Paris, several recluses occupied the abbey of Port Royal des Champs ; these recluses included such men as Le Maître, Lancelot, Le Maître de Sacy, Nicole, and others. Thus there was formed a body of men, who were prepared to maintain the doctrines of the Gospel so far as they understood them. On the return of part of the nuns to Port Royal des Champs, the recluses removed to an abode called Les Granges.

The influence which the Mère Angelique possessed with her own family was remarkable. No less than eighteen of them were

* The Port-Royalists, in their persecutions, were particularly anxious to repudiate the reproach of Protestantism, with which some charged them. Hence they speak in indignant terms of Basil's 'apostacy.' It was also a sore point that many of the Jansenists had Huguenot relations ; amongst others, two of the aunts of Mère Angelique. The accusation of Protestantism was one great hindrance to the Jansenists in looking simply at revealed truth.

† A Protestant can only see in the *Chapelet Secret du Saint Sacrement* a painful display of superstition. St. Cyran, however, could only criticise it from the point of view common to himself and its denouncers.

to be found in the two companies of nuns and recluses. One of her brothers was Henri Arnauld, Bishop of Angers (1649-92), and another was the celebrated Antoine Arnauld, doctor of the Sorbonne.

Cardinal Richelieu had in vain sought to obtain the influence of M. de St. Cyran to promote his own ends ; and, having failed in his overtures, that crafty and tyrannical minister sought to crush the individual whom he had previously flattered and courted. Richelieu now lent a willing ear to those who charged St. Cyran with heterodoxy. These accusations were indeed brought by the whole Jesuit party, and thus May 14th, 1638, M. de St. Cyran was immured in the dungeons of Vincennes, eight days after the death of Jansenius.

Two months after the death of Richelieu, St. Cyran was freed from his captivity ; this was on the 6th of February, 1643. In the interim, the *Augustinus* of Jansenius had appeared, and also M. de St. Cyran's own disciples had increased both in numbers and in activity. But his own health was irrecoverably broken down ; he lingered a few months, and then expired October 11th, in the same year, aged sixty-two.

It may be asked, How could men possessed of so much light as Jansenius and St. Cyran and their many followers, live and die in acknowledged fellowship with the Church of Rome ? To explain this strange inconsistency we may refer to Martin Luther. He had learned the Gospel of Christ, but it was the actings of Rome against him that taught him the depth of evil which is found in the Romish system. Thus, in his earlier preaching, it is said of him by Melancthon, 'He explained that sin is freely pardoned on account of God's son, and that man receives this blessing through faith. He in no way interfered with the usual ceremonies. The established discipline had not in all his order a more faithful observer and defender. But he laboured more to make all understand the grand and essential doctrines of conversion, of the forgiveness of sins, of faith, and of the true consolations of the cross.' This may explain an inconsistency which, in itself, can never be defended.

The publication of the '*Augustinus*' presented to the Jesuits and their party as definite a subject of attack as the work of Molina had been half a century before to their opponents. In 1642 a general condemnation of the works of Jansenius was procured from Pope Urban VIII., in the bull *In eminenti*. So decisive a point would not have been gained by the Molinists, had they not succeeded in directing the attention of the Papal court to a passage in which Jansenius brought forward a statement of St. Augustine as authoritative, although the same point (without reference,

reference, of course, to that father) had been condemned at Rome. This was an inroad on papal infallibility, and *this* caused the rejection of the work.

But the controversy still continued: many did not receive the bull. It is only those who have had some familiarity with such canonical strifes, who can at all apprehend the distinctions which may be drawn as to the force and effect of a papal bull. The *intention* of Rome was, however, plain enough.

The strife still went on in France, when the Jesuit party sought, if possible, to crush Port Royal and all connected with it. Father Cornet drew up five propositions, as containing the especial points in the doctrines of Jansenius. Let these propositions be condemned as heretical, and then, of course, Jansenism must fall. The propositions were mostly couched in somewhat ambiguous language, so as to admit of very different explanations; the object in this was to procure their condemnation in any sense or in any form.^s

Proceedings commenced at Rome; thirteen theological consultants were convened, of whom Luke Wadding, the historian of the Franciscan order, two Dominicans, and the General of the Augustine order objected to a condemnation being expressed. They well saw that the doctrines of St. Augustine were attacked. The other nine, however, condemned the propositions; the advocates for Jansenism confined themselves almost entirely to a defence of prevenient and efficacious grace. Had not the idea of touching these points been excluded, the Dominicans and others would have resisted all condemnation. The contemptible Pope Innocent X., who hated all theological studies, cared nothing about the question; he also expected no good results to spring from a decision. Cardinal Chigi, however, his Secretary of State, urged him on; the passage which seemed to question Papal infallibility was enough to excite the animosity of the Secretary. Innocent X., therefore, decided on condemning the five propositions as heretical, false, rash, impious, and blasphemous. The condemnation is dated May 31st, 1653.

^s The following are the celebrated propositions:—

‘ I. *Aliqua Dei præcepta hominibus justis volentibus, et conantibus, secundum præsentem quas habent vires, sunt impossibilia: deest quoque illis gratia, qua possibilia fiant.*

‘ II. *Interiori gratiæ, in statu naturæ lapsæ, nunquam resistitur.*

‘ III. *Ad merendum, et demerendum in statu naturæ lapsæ, non requiritur in homine libertas à necessitate, sed sufficit libertas à coactione.*

‘ IV. *Semipelagiani admittebant prævenientis gratiæ interioris necessitatem ad singulos actus, etiam ad initium fidei: et in hoc erant hæretici, quod vellent eam gratiam talem esse, cui posset humana voluntas resistere, vel obtemperare.*

‘ V. *Semipelagianum est, dicere Christum pro omnibus omnino hominibus mortuum esse, aut sanguinem fudisse.*

The

The Jesuits had thus a weapon to use against Port Royal, which they so much hated, not merely because of the doctrinal points now discussed, but also on grounds of long standing. To the family of Arnauld they appeared to have an hereditary hatred, in the remembrance of the manner in which the father of Mère Angelique had acted against the Jesuits in the days of their early introduction into France, when with extraordinary force and eloquence he attacked their institute, and charged home upon their order the crime of the murder of Henry III. The pent-up wrath of half a century was now to fall with full force on Port Royal—the stronghold of Jansenism, the scene of the reform of Mère Angelique Arnauld.

The Jansenists were called on to condemn the five propositions ; to the surprise and mortification of the Jesuits, they avowed their willingness to do so, with the qualification, however, that they did this in their *heretical* sense, and that they denied the propositions to be really contained in the work of Jansenius. The Jesuits were thus checked for a time. The Jansenists took advantage of the ignorance of their adversaries as to the writings of the Fathers, by publishing, without any author's name, an epistle of St. Prosper (the scholar of St. Augustine) to Rufinus. The Jesuits denounced this as a new piece of Jansenist heresy ; and when the real history and authorship of the epistle were made known, and the blindness of the Jesuits was manifested, then they found means of understanding the anti-Pelagian work in an orthodox sense. Thus tortuous is the spirit of persecution. The same words and sentences which were heretical if used by a Jansenist, were orthodox if used by St. Prosper. The question was not *what* is said, but *who* says it.

The next step of the Jesuit party was to procure a farther declaration from Rome as to the question of *fact*, that the five propositions were actually contained in the work of Jansenius. Innocent X. decreed this September 29th, 1654. Hence arose the celebrated distinction of '*fait*' and '*droit*'—*fact* and *right*. The Jansenists denied the Papal authority to extend to infallible decrees as to points of *fact*. In this distinction they were borne out by the highest Romish authorities. They admitted the Pope's *right* in doctrinal judgments, supposing that God guided His Church infallibly ; but where supernatural judgment was not needed, they held that the Pope might be wrong : he might be misinformed, ignorant, or prejudiced.^h

While

^h The Mère Angelique had a goodly proof, in her own history, that the Pope was liable to be surprised. Clement VIII. was imposed on, and thus he acknowledged her to be seventeen when she was but eleven. He *must* then have been fallible in matter

While this distinction was under discussion, the Duke of Liancourt, a man of well-known piety, was refused absolution by a priest of St. Sulpice, unless he removed his granddaughter from under the care of the nuns of Port Royal, and cast off and condemned the Jansenists. This led to the appearance of two letters on the subjects of discussion from the pen of Dr. Antoine Arnauld. This celebrated Jansenist was now an object of especial enmity to the Jesuits; a work which he had published, in which he had maintained the necessity of real evangelical repentance before God, had given them the greatest offence.

Two propositions were extracted from Dr. Arnauld's second letter, and on these the Sorbonne, the theological faculty of Paris, sat in judgment. At length, January 31st, 1656, after very much discussion, a majority condemned the statements of Dr. Arnauld, and excluded him from the Sorbonne. This decision was obtained by a most disgraceful combination of parties; the Jesuits could not have overcome without the aid of their former antagonists the Dominicans; and both combined against the Jansenists, uniting in a form of condemnation which the two parties could not have agreed on except by using the same terms in senses entirely different.

The full enmity of the dominant party in France was now declared. All were to be regarded as heretics who upheld the five propositions, or who condemned the propositions and yet denied that they were in the work of Jansenius; and so, too, those who held any intercourse with those who refused to subscribe the formulary. A man was made responsible for his neighbour's faith as well as his own. How far the Jesuit party could go in their *assertions* is shown by the statement which they had the hardihood to make. They said that the propositions were all in Jansenius *in so many words* ('Singulares, individuae, totidem verbis apud Jansenium contentae'), and they thought it a heresy not to acknowledge this!

Farther to injure the Jansenists, reports were spread which sought to damage Jansenius's moral character; this was part of a course of reckless falsehood quite consistent with a bad cause, sustained with evil arts.

Preparations were soon made for scattering the community of Port Royal, and placing them under close captivity, so as to bring them to submission. It seemed a strange spectacle that a body of women, and a few others who agreed with them in senti-

matter of fact. The Mère Angelique was confirmed by the Pope as abbess when she actually became seventeen; subsequently she laid down her dignity, and made the office of abbess elective triennially.

ment,

ment, should withstand the power of the decrees of Rome, and all the pertinacity of the Jesuits in carrying out those decrees.

On March 30th, 1656, two months after the condemnation of Dr. Arnauld, the civil authorities proceeded to carry out an order in council that every scholar, postulant, and novice should be removed from Port Royal. This was to be the first step in the direct work of persecution.

But the hands of the opposers were checked: there was a sudden and absolute pause. This cessation was commonly attributed to a *miracle wrought on a scholar at Port Royal de Paris* a few days before. At all events, both parties equally believed in the miracle as real, and the ecclesiastical authorities of France solemnly announced it. Perhaps, however, there were also other causes. Cardinal Mazarin, the minister of France, was not on good terms with the Pope, and at this juncture he might well desire not to show too great alacrity in causing the will of the Pope to be carried into execution: he might thus gladly avail himself of the *miracle*¹ in question. It was the Cardinal himself who caused it to be published.

Another cause for minds being diverted from the persecution of the nuns was found in the 'Lettres à un Provincial' of Pascal, which at this juncture were making their appearance from time to time. In these remarkable letters he showed with extraordinary force how narrow the question really was—whether five Propositions are in the Augustinus or not—when no one had there pointed them out: he showed by what unworthy compromises the condemnation of Dr. Arnauld had been obtained; and, besides touching on doctrinal points which were involved, he firmly and manfully attacked the shameless casuistry of the

¹ The 'miracle' was briefly this:—Mademoiselle Marguerite Perrier (Pascal's niece), a child of ten years old, was a boarder at Port-Royal de Paris. She had long suffered *dreadfully* in her left eye, so that she had become an object of pity. Soeur Flavie Passart, the nun under whose *exclusive* care she was, recommended her to apply to the eye a holy thorn which was honoured as a relic of our Lord's crown. She did this; and a report soon spread that she was entirely healed. The surgeon who came to examine the eye a few days afterwards found that it was *quite well*. Such are the simple facts.

Flavie Passart afterwards became a known and marked deceiver in getting up feigned miracles with great ingenuity; illnesses were brought on simply as an opportunity for a new miracle. This may cause us to receive *her* testimony with caution in the present case. As she had the entire charge of the child, she might have imposed by irritative applications both on the little girl herself and on the medical attendants. She was at first the only one who knew of the *miracle*. Mademoiselle Perrier had no doubt on the subject herself; she knew that she had suffered dreadfully, and that she had recovered: she lived till 1733. But the question always is, How far were both the sufferings and its removal contrived by Flavie. It should be stated that at this time no one suspected Flavie's course of hypocrisy, which was afterwards so manifest.

Jesuits. *These* letters had a wonderful efficiency, for their power was felt even by those who had no apprehension of the present subjects of controversy. Pascal gave such extracts from the approved writings of the order as filled men with amazement. At first he printed these without referring to the works cited; the Jesuits denied such abominable opinions to be maintained by their approved writers. Pascal then pointed out the places from which he had quoted; the discovery *ought* to have covered the Jesuits with confusion.^k He illustrates with great clearness and vivacity the view which the Jansenists took of the fallibility of the Pope on questions of *fact*. He plainly tells a Jesuit, whom he addresses—

‘It was in vain that you obtained against Galileo a decree from Rome condemnatory of his opinion respecting the motion of the earth. This would never prove that it remains fixed; and if there be observed facts which prove that the earth moves, all men together can neither hinder it from moving, nor hinder themselves from moving along with it.’ Do not you also suppose that the Epistles of Pope Zachary for the excommunication of St. Virgilius, because he maintained that there are antipodes, should have annihilated the new world? And inasmuch as this error had been declared very dangerous, ought the King of Spain to have believed the testimony of Columbus, who said he was come from the new world, rather than the judgment of the Pope, who had not been there?’

By way of answer the Jesuits cried out that the writer of the letters was a *heretic*, and that a heretic must not be *believed*.^m How often this kind of outcry has been used by those who wish to exercise ecclesiastical oppression, must be familiar to all who are acquainted with church history.

^k Casuistry of the most scandalously immoral kind had been pointed out a few years before this time in the writings of the Jesuit Bauny. The Jesuits boldly avowed that the opinions were ‘detestable;’ that they ‘marked an abandoned conscience;’ a holder of such ideas must be ‘an organ of the demon.’ They denied, however, that the book of Bauny contained the cited passage, and thus they raised a loud outcry of fraud and imposture. *They*, however, were the fraudulent impostors themselves: the passage was Bauny’s. At length, when all *knew* that the opinion had been held by a Jesuit, they turned round and affirmed the doctrine to be *innocent*! Oh, the tortuosity of those who defend abominations and deal in calumnies!

^m This remark was all the more cutting since the same Pope, Urban VIII., who condemned Galileo, also was the first to condemn the work of Jansenism. It may be consolatory for the reader to be informed that the Pope in 1821 repealed the censure on the earth for moving; so that it has gone round the sun twenty-nine times, and also turned on its own axis for twenty-nine years, freed from the danger of the papal ban.

ⁿ Pascal says: ‘Vous dites que, pour toute réponse à mes quinze lettres, il suffit de dire quinze fois que je suis hérétique; et qu’étant déclaré tel, je ne mérite aucune grâce.’

The nuns of Port Royal were allowed a few years of tranquillity: Rome, however, was yet further preparing its weapons. It was needful to have such decrees as would admit of no evasion. At first, through the error of a Jesuit, it had been maintained that the five propositions were found *in so many words* (*totidem verbis*) in Jansenius: this, however, was a statement that refuted itself. The question then turned on the *substance* and *sense*. It was easy to point out statements of Jansenius which resembled the propositions: resemblance, however, is not identity—*nonne canis lupo simillimus*; and as these passages in Jansenius rested on St. Augustine (whom the Pope of course had not condemned), everything turned on the *sense* in which expressions were used.

Alexander VII. was now Pope, the same individual who, when Cardinal Chigi, had been instrumental in procuring the original decree of Innocent X. On the 16th of November, 1656 (soon after the miracle of Port Royal had been solemnly declared at Paris), the Pope issued a new bull, afresh condemning the five propositions, and repeating the determination that they *are* in the Augustinus; and further adding that the *sense* in which they were condemned was the *sense* in which they had been stated by Jansenius.

Four years afterwards Louis XIV. gave effect to this bull.* In December, 1660, he convened an assembly of bishops, avowing his intention of exterminating Jansenism. De Marca, the crafty and unscrupulous Archbishop of Toulouse, prepared a formulary which might entrap all who did not yield blind submission to Rome.

‘I condemn from my inmost soul, and by word of mouth, the doctrine of the five propositions, which are contained in the work of Cornelius Jansenius, a doctrine which is not that of St. Augustine, whose sentiments Jansenius has misinterpreted.’

Subscription to this formulary, confirmed by an oath, was demanded from all the clergy, and all who were engaged in tuition of any kind: the presentation of such forms to the laity was a new step on the part of the Church of Rome.

* Louis XIV. gave great power to the Jesuits, who in their turn flattered and caressed him. He as yet, however, cared but little about the Romish faith; his own pleasure and power were his idols. He one day asked the Count de Grammont to read the *Augustinus*, and to tell him whether the five propositions were in it or not. The count probably excused himself from such a long theological study: he reported, however, to the king that he had read the book, but that he had not met with the propositions; he added to this that they might for all that be there *incognito*.

Persecution now commenced in earnest. The dungeons of the Bastille were crowded with those who refused to violate their consciences by subscribing what they did not believe. The very passages of the fortress were occupied by prisoners. M. de Sacy, the nephew of Mère Angelique, carried on during this imprisonment his well-known version of the Scriptures. Henri Arnauld, Bishop of Angers, and three other bishops, refused to accept the formulary, be the consequences what they might.

But it was upon Port Royal that the principal fury of the tempest discharged itself. The Mère Angelique, who was then on her deathbed, encouraged the nuns to firmness in their maintenance of a good conscience. She had the pain, in her last days, of seeing seventy-five scholars, novices, and postulants removed by force from the shelter of Port Royal. After rather more than three months of trial, the Mère Angelique breathed her last, August 6, 1661, aged seventy. She left her sister, the gentle-souled Mère Agnes, and her niece, the clear-minded and spiritual Mère Angelique de St. Jean, as the principal upholders of Port Royal and its testimony.

Every effort that could be devised was put forth to make the nuns sign the formulary. How could they be so obstinate in their own opinions? Is the matter in question—whether certain propositions are in a book or not—such that it should be treated as one of great importance? Why should such a point be made about upholding the writings and opinions of one man?

The replies to these considerations were simple and easy. It was not the magnitude of the point at issue, but its *truth*, that gave it its importance. They did not *believe* the propositions were in Jansenius, they could not therefore declare them to be there; they did not believe that Jansenius had misrepresented St. Augustine, nor could they on such grounds say that he had done so. And as to *maintaining* one person's opinions, they could only say that *they* had not raised the controversy, but those who had impugned Jansenius. And as to themselves personally, the nuns stated that the work of Jansenius being in Latin, they could not declare on oath what its contents might be, for they could not even read it; they knew, however, that no one had pointed out the propositions, as condemned, in the work itself.

Some years of suffering and imprisonment now fell on the nuns. These trials were sustained with that patience which the Lord can vouchsafe to His people. It is not, however, surprising that some, overawed by their ecclesiastical superiors, subscribed the formulary. It is worthy of remark that those who did so had previously been the most *enthusiastic* in their Jansenism, with more of partisanship than of principle: such, when they had once condemned

condemned Jansenius, became the most treacherous and implacable adversaries of those who remained steadfast: this was particularly the case with some whom *gratitude* ought to have restrained.

France at this time exhibited a strange spectacle—all the ingenuity of the Jesuits, all the resources of Rome, and all the power of the most absolute king in Europe, vainly seeking to overcome the constancy and to rule the consciences of a few weak women. The recluses had been scattered or consigned to dungeons, but the nuns were a definite *body*, against which the many waves dashed and broke: they dashed in vain, and could not overwhelm, for there is One who ruleth the raging of the sea and the strivings of the people.

In 1668 a change took place. Clement IX. had such representations made to him that he accepted the Jansenist subscription, by which they rejected the five propositions without reference to Jansenius's works, and with reservation of all senses laid down by St. Augustine: this was called the Pacification of Clement IX. It could not be said that the nuns signed any formulary at all; all charge of heresy was removed on their giving, each of them, a statement in writing of what they believed on the subjects contained in the five propositions.

The prison doors were opened; the Jansenists who had been concealed could again publicly appear; and eleven tranquil years shone on Port Royal. It is true that the community had lost their house of Port Royal de Paris, which had been given to the few compliant nuns during the persecution; but still they had Port Royal des Champs, their original seat and sphere of usefulness.

Jansenistic principles now became far more widely diffused. The authorities of the Church of Rome thought a Jansenist was not necessarily a heretic; the schools of Port Royal flourished even more than before the persecution and imprisonment: the Jansenists busied themselves in circulating the Scriptures in French.

In 1679 the Duchess of Longueville died: she had long been considered the protectress of Port Royal from the displeasure of the King and the Jesuits: it became manifest that this had been the case.

A few weeks only passed before the Jesuits procured an order from the king that the recluses should quit the valley of Port Royal *at once and for ever*. The nuns were then prohibited from receiving scholars or novices. A lingering persecution of *thirty years* ensued, in which the suffering nuns exhibited no small measure of Christian grace.

The Jesuit confessors of the King ruled with a high hand in spiritual affairs ; the Protestants were oppressed by the revocation of the edict of Nantes and the subsequent frightful sufferings ; the Jansenists were scattered ; Fenelon was banished ; and yet at the same time Louis XIV. restrained the authority of the Pope in his dominions. All that he thus gained from the court of Rome was so much the more authority in the hands of the Jesuits.

Amongst others who had received some Jansenistic doctrines were that learned and laborious body the French Benedictines. They commenced the publication of a complete edition of the works of St. Augustine in 1679, the year of the recommencement of the persecution. For this they used ancient and authoritative MSS., and all were astonished to find that St. Augustine appeared far more of a Jansenist than ever before. The truth is, that copyists and editors had *altered* passages from time to time so as to make them less offensive to the Romish prejudices. Thus even Jansenius had never known the full Augustinianism of St. Augustine himself. The Jesuits charged the Benedictines with having *falsified* their MSS., a charge which only recoiled on those who brought it.

Amongst those who in the last thirty years of the seventeenth century especially upheld the doctrines of grace in France was Quesnel, one of the Fathers of the Oratory. His *Réflexions Morales* found many readers, and they were recommended by many bishops. Surely we may conclude from this that many hearts responded to the Christian truth which he had thus taught. Some, however, changed with changing circumstances. De Noailles, as Bishop of Châlons, had in 1695 strongly recommended Quesnel's writings to his diocese ; but scarcely a year after, when he was made Archbishop of Paris, the same De Noailles became the opponent and condemner of works precisely similar. The King and the Jesuits *would* be obeyed, and De Noailles had the weakness to comply.

The same archbishop (who became Cardinal De Noailles) afterwards went further still in his defections. A few years later the Jesuit party, with the powerful influence of Madame de Maintenon, decided on the *entire* destruction of the community of Port Royal des Champs ; they would not wait the deaths of a few ladies, mostly elderly ; they betook themselves to speedier measures. A question was raised how far the sacrament of the Lord's Supper could be conscientiously administered to those who had not signed the whole formulary. At the same time Port Royal de Paris was encouraged to carry on a law-suit against Port Royal des Champs, demanding all the property of *both* houses.

De

De Noailles entreated the nuns to sign the formulary as a matter of *human faith*. Had they done this, all molestation as to property and liberty would cease. In 1705 Clement XI. issued his bull *Vineam Domini Sabaoth*, in which he attacked the doctrines of grace, and took as high a ground on the Jansenist points as Alexander VII. himself. The nuns refused to receive this bull. The last abbess, Madame de Boulard, died in 1706, and no royal permission had been given to elect a successor. The dying abbess named as prioress Madame Dumesnil Courtaux, who had to sustain the last storm.

The King and the Jesuits procured whatever bulls they wanted from the Pope ; and when these did not sufficiently set forth the Jansenist heresy of the nuns, they were returned from Paris to Rome with corrections and alterations, to which the Pope acceded. The title-deeds of Port Royal des Champs were in the hands of M. de St. Claude, one of the recluses. To obtain possession of these documents, the Jesuits caused him to be arrested and sent to the Bastille, and they seized all his papers : he remained in prison for seven years.

On January 20, 1709, Père le Chaise, the king's confessor, died, aged eighty-five years : he rejoiced that he had lived to see the axe laid at the root of the heretical tree. On the following 11th of July, Cardinal de Noailles was forced to issue his order for the suppression of the abbey. On the 29th of October following the valley was filled with troops ; a commissary entered the abbey, who demanded all title-deeds that they might have there ; he then further declared his commission to disperse the nuns immediately. The prioress gave them her blessing for the last time, and they were sent separately into confinement in different nunneries, as obstinate heretics. Their removal was accompanied by circumstances of great cruelty.

To be condemned as *heretics* was to them a bitter cup : they were deprived of the sacraments, which from *their* point of view was a sentence of the extremest character. Thus they passed years of suffering. The mother-prioress was confined at Blois, where she died, after six years of captivity. In her last illness she was allowed no rest on the subject of the formulary. The Bishop of Blois troubled her incessantly ; she must either sign or else die without the sacraments. What an alternative to one who regards the Lord's Supper with the Romanist aspect ! The grace of the Gospel, however, triumphed. The bishop asked her, 'What will you do when you have to appear before God, bearing the weight of your sins alone ?' The dying prioress replied, 'Having made peace through the blood of His cross, my Saviour hath reconciled all things unto Himself in the body of His flesh

through death, to present us holy and unblameable and unreprouvable in His sight, if we continue in the faith grounded and settled, and be not moved away from the hope of the Gospel.' She then added, with clasped hands, 'In Thee, O Lord, have I trusted, nor wilt Thou suffer the creature that trusts in Thee to be confounded.' The bishop *reviled* this dying saint, who meekly besought, with many tears, that she might be permitted to receive the sacrament. The bishop absolutely rejected her request, as coming from a confirmed heretic. 'Well, my lord,' she replied, wiping her eyes, 'I am content to bear with resignation whatever deprivation my God sees fit; I am convinced that His divine grace can supply even the want of sacraments.' She fell asleep in the Lord the same night, March 18, 1716, in her seventieth year. Such was the evangelical spirit of the holy confessors of Port Royal.

The nuns were dispersed in 1709: in the following year the cloister was pulled down; in 1711 the bodies were disinterred from the burial-ground, with the grossest brutalities and indecency; and in 1713 the church itself was demolished.^p Thus fell Port Royal; and De Noailles had ordered this work of destruction, not from hate, but simply from weakness!

Bitter indeed was the cardinal's remorse of conscience; his criminal compliance with the demands of an earthly sovereign pressed on his spirit as an intolerable load. At length, in solemn testimony of his repentance of the crime in which he had been made, through his weakness, a participant, he went himself to the ruins of Port Royal that he might there mourn as a penitent: he would see in those ruins the extent of the desolation which he had caused—he would look at all the magnitude of his offence before God, and as his sin had been public, so should be his repentance. He approached the spot with bitter groanings; he exclaimed, 'I will not be spared any part—I will see my enormous sin in all its horrors. Here, in the midst of this miserable devastation, *here* will I unburden my mind—*here* it may be (oh, may it indeed be *here*!) that the God of all compassion will yet have mercy on *me*, a miserable sinner.' He looked at the devastated burial-ground, which *once* had contained the remains of many holy servants and confessors of Christ; the sight seemed to fill him with despair. 'Oh!' he cried, 'all these dismantled stones will rise against me

^p The abbey of St. Cyran, which had given its name to M. de St. Cyran, was also levelled with the ground. In the time of Barcos, M. de St. Cyran's nephew, Jansenism had prevailed in it. Lancelot, the Port-Royal writer, who had there become a Benedictine monk, was banished to Quimperley, in Lower Brittany. He died at the age of 97, Apr. 15, 1712.

at the day of judgment! Oh! how shall I ever bear the vast, the heavy load!’

Let us not judge the Cardinal de Noailles too harshly; he had tried to maintain a high place in court favour, and step after step of criminal compliance led at length to those deeds, the memory of which plunged him into this depth of anguish.

De Noailles earnestly desired to repair, as far as still was possible, the evil which he had wrought: so long, however, as Louis XIV. lived nothing could be done. On the death of that monarch, in September, 1715, the power of Madame de Maintenon ceased, and from that time the efforts on behalf of the imprisoned nuns were more effectual. At length the six surviving sufferers were released, five of them were received into the abbey of Malnourne and one in that of Etrées, as honoured confessors of Christ. To their prayers did the Cardinal de Noailles commend himself; and he became the avowed advocate and protector of those to whom he had caused such suffering.¹ May we not trust that his repentance of heart had indeed been wrought by the Spirit of God, and that the prayers of those who forgave, even as they had been forgiven of God for Christ’s sake, had been heard on his behalf. We may admire the working of the grace of God; the suffering prioress and the guilty cardinal might alike meet in the presence of God through the blood and merits of Christ our Saviour.

Father Quesnel has already been mentioned, whose writings had done much to spread truth in France. He, too, had fallen under the displeasure of the Jesuit advisers of Louis XIV. That monarch, in consequence, procured from Rome the bull *Unigenitus*, condemnatory of his writings, and all that had been written, or that ever might appear, in their defence. In this bull, which Clement XI. issued September 8, 1713, one hundred and one propositions extracted from the writings of Quesnel were condemned, ‘as false, captious, evil sounding, offensive to pious ears, scandalous, pernicious, rash, injurious to the Church and its customs, contumelious, not against the Church merely but also against the secular authorities, seditious, impious, blasphemous, suspected of heresy, and also savouring of heresy itself; also

¹ When Madame de Valois (the nun who afterwards resided in the abbey of Etrées) was freed from her imprisonment, De Noailles wrote to her on the subject of her now being admitted to the sacrament. In greater testimony to her not being a heretic, he proposed that this solemnity should take place publicly at Paris, at the church of St. Geneviève. This should be another proof of his repentance for the unjust excommunication. It took place accordingly at that church; but Madame de Valois, out of delicacy to the feelings of the cardinal, caused it to be at four o’clock in the morning.

favouring heretics, heresies, and schism, erroneous, nearly allied to heresy, often condemned; and furthermore, also heretical; and sundry *heresies*, especially those contained in the well-known propositions of Jansenius, and that, too, in the sense in which those were condemned.' The bull did not specify *which* of the propositions belonged severally to each of these heads of condemnation.

This was the triumph of doctrinal Jesuitism: Le Tellier, the King's Jesuit confessor, arranged the terms of the bull. It seemed as if every feeling of piety towards God, and every apprehension of His grace, was to be extinguished throughout the Papal Church—as if all who adhered at all to many doctrines that had been regarded as orthodox, were to have their feelings and their consciences outraged. The Jesuits earnestly pressed the acceptance of this bull.[†]

Quesnel, like many other leading Jansenists, had found a refuge in the Netherlands; he continued to maintain his doctrines, and defend their orthodoxy, until his death, which occurred at Amsterdam in 1719; he was then eighty-five.

The bull *Unigenitus* was, however, by no means generally received: there was, indeed, no longer a united body, like Port Royal, to act as a focus of Jansenism, but the scattered Jansenists were numerous, for had there been no Port Royal, Jansenism would equally have existed. Their numbers now increased, from the fact that any who had even a slight apprehension of grace found themselves opposed by this decree. The Jansenists continued to be proscribed in France, but all their oppressions and persecutions led to many feeling a warm sympathy on their behalf. Not only did some Roman Catholic countries refuse to receive the bull, but even in France several bishops solemnly *appealed from the decision of Pope Clement XI. to the next general council*.

The bull *Unigenitus* placed Jansenism on a new ground; it no longer professed submission to *doctrinal* decisions of the popedom.

[†] The following were some of the anathematized propositions:—

' 27. Faith is the primary grace, and the fountain of all others. 2 Pet. i. 3.'

' 50. In vain do we cry to God, My Father, unless the spirit of love be that which cries. Rom. viii. 15.'

' 55. God only crowns *love*: he who runs from another impulse, from any other motive, runs in vain. 1 Cor. vi. (*sic*) 34.'

' 58. Where there is not love there is neither God nor religion. 1 John iv. 8.'

' 76. Nothing is more extensive than the Church of God, for all the elect righteous of all ages compose it. Eph. ii. 22.'

' 91. The fear of unjust excommunication ought never to hinder us from fulfilling our duty. We never go out of the Church, even when we seem to be expelled from it by the wickedness of men, when through love we are united to God, to Jesus Christ, and to the Church itself. John ix. 22, 23.'

The Jansenists *now* lamented that they had not plainly seen from the first the point at which Rome was aiming, the rejection of the doctrines found in St. Augustine's works.*

In tracing the course of the Jansenists we must bear in mind how they had received as an axiom that out of the Church there is no salvation; and then, by identifying Roman Catholicism with the Church, they were driven into the inconsistency of conceding to the papal decisions as far as their consciences could at all go. This led to not a few of their weaknesses.

This later phase of Jansenism, in which papal infallibility was *utterly* repudiated, even while the endeavour was made to preserve Church unity, extended its influence widely. Ranke says of the Jansenists of this period, 'We find traces of them in Vienna and in Brussels, in Spain and Portugal, and in every part of Italy. They disseminated their doctrines throughout all Roman Catholic Christendom, sometimes openly, oftener in secret.'

The Jesuits, meanwhile, had Rome fully in their power. Their acts and intrigues, however, excited deeper and deeper discontent. Strong representations were made to Pope Benedict XIV., who probably would have remodeled the order, and restrained it, if he had lived longer. His successor, Clement XIII., favoured the Jesuits. All Europe, however, rang with well-founded charges against them—the courts were alarmed; they were excluded from some countries, and a modification of the order was *demande*d. Lorenzo Ricci, the general of the order, was inflexible; he maintained, *sint ut sunt, aut non sint*. The Pope said that the formal sanction of the constitution of the order by the Church *could not be changed*.

In the beginning of 1769, the ambassadors of Naples, Spain, and France appeared before the Pope, and *demande*d the *suppression* of the order. The Pope convened a consistory, but the blow was too great for him; he expired, February 2, the evening before it should have met.

He was succeeded by Pope Clement XIV., of *honoured* memory,† a Pope tinged with Jansenist sentiments, and thus upholding

* It is too obvious to need much remark that the question, 'What saith the Scripture?' had but little prominence in the history of Jansenism. They read and prized the Scriptures; but *their idea* of 'the Church' had too strong a hold on their minds to lead them *simply* to the word of God. The questions were thus narrowed to how far were certain Scripture doctrines recognized by the Fathers? Happily they fixed on the same anti-Pelagian statements, which gave light also to the Reformers.

† The Jesuits have in vain sought to asperse the character of this man; their unrelenting enmity has even extended to the forging of writings in his name of an infidel tendency. *God* hath said, 'Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour.' The Jesuits are charged on good grounds with having poisoned this Pope.

ing the doctrines of St. Augustine. After a formal process, he *abolished* the order by the brief '*Dominus ac Redemptor*,' July 21, 1773.^a

For forty years the Jesuit institute was thus proscribed; when in our days Pius VII. was induced, in an evil hour, to restore the order, as an important buttress of the papacy. He issued his bull for that purpose ('*Sollicitudo omnium Ecclesiarum*'), August 7, 1814.

Unhappily, Jesuitism has only been resuscitated to a course of as much evil, and of more dexterous policy, than before.*

Many

Pope. Some of the order have seemed to make a *merit* of this murder! The Lord will judge righteously between the Jesuits and their victims.

The writer was frequently asked at Rome the ensnaring question, 'Do you like the Jesuits?' To this he replied (perhaps too freely), 'No!' To the farther query, 'Why not?' he used to find the most convenient answer to be, 'For the same reasons that led Pope Clement XIV. to abolish the order.' This was in general enough.

^a It is instructive to observe how the Jesuits, in opposing Jansenism, really led the way to the suppression of their own order. They reckoned more than ever on the goodwill of the papal court, and, ruling with a high hand, they lost their former tact: a rigid policy was all that remained.

The united acts of Louis XIV. and the Jesuits, in crushing alike Protestants, Quietists, and Jansenists, drove religion well nigh out of France. What a spectacle! The same monarch, under the influence of the same evil-minded and pharisaical woman, persecuting not only Protestants, but also such men as Fenelon, among the brightest and holiest of those who owned the authority of Rome. Thus was the train laid which led to the fearful explosion in which altar and throne alike fell, and *atheism* was nationally embraced. How the mind of Voltaire was affected by the abominable deeds of men who *professed* the name of Christ, is shown by his juvenile verses, in which he speaks so indignantly of the destruction of Port-Royal that he was sent for a year to the Bastille.

* The *mode* of acting adopted by the Jesuits is varied according to circumstances, but the *end* is always the same,—the aggrandizement of the order, united with implacable opposition to evangelic truth. When the states of Europe were ruled by despotic monarchs, they sought dominion through them; *now*, however, they conform themselves to sentiments of a more liberal kind—*when they find it fit*.

It is difficult to say *where* Jesuits do not introduce themselves, and *where* they do not obtain *indirect* power through other Roman Catholic orders. One danger is, that the Jesuits are so untangible a body, that it is often difficult really to know who does or does not belong to the order. There appear to be only one or two 'houses of profession' out of Rome; and thus, while there are comparatively few who have taken *all* the vows, there are a vast number of persons attached to the order, but in a different position. No civil state would admit into its bosom those who maintain and practise the principles of Jesuitism, did it really *know* what those principles are, and could it be easily ascertained who are Jesuits and who are not.

The principles which cause *any crime* committed in obedience to the superior to be regarded as a *religious duty*, and the frightful casuistry which rejects the solemn obligation of an oath, show how demoralized and demoralizing the order must be. It rarely happens, however, that any one puts himself forward ostensibly as a Jesuit, unless he be a person of superior address and intelligence—one who is likely to commend his order in public estimation. It must also be remembered that when a Jesuit finds himself in a country where Jesuits are not admitted, his order can make provision that his membership in it shall be in abeyance for the time being: this makes it difficult to deal with him as an actual Jesuit. The provision is of course

Many lessons may be learned from the excellences, the defects, the services, and the sufferings of Port Royal. We may see how hopeless an attempt it is fully to carry out the truth of God when the communion of Rome is at *all* owned. We may see how His grace may work even there—we may see how He can honour the service of those who have but very partial light; and the persecution shows us not only the evil character of Jesuitism (a system against which we cannot be too much on our guard), but it also exhibits bright examples on the part of the sufferers. 'This is thankworthy, if a man for conscience toward God endure grief, suffering wrongfully' (1 Pet. ii. 19). 'Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven' (Matt. v. 10).

In vain do men on earth presume to condemn faithful believers in a crucified Saviour as heretics; their master bids them rejoice, for great is their reward in heaven. The Church has ever professed its belief in 'the communion of saints:' will not every one who rests on the blood and righteousness of Christ, and who loves Him and his members, rejoice that they shall meet in the Church triumphant with such as Jansenius, St. Cyran, the Arnaulds, Pascal, De Sacy, and Quesnel?

§ II.—THE CONTINUANCE OF THE JANSENISTS IN THE ARCHBISHOPRIC OF UTRECHT.

It was a Protestant country that afforded such a refuge and shelter to the remnant of the Jansenists that they could again appear as a definite and tangible body.' There were in Holland many

course a mere name—a mere fiction; and he acts all the while as a devoted servant of his superiors.

The hateful casuistry by which oaths are regarded as mere *jests*, 'because the inward intention to swear was wanting,' is a solemn subject. It stands in immediate connection with the Pope's dispensing power in the case of oaths. Protestant governments were formerly so much alive on the point, that in the ratification of a treaty they took no oath from a Roman Catholic prince, but required *his word of honour as a knight and a gentleman*. Over this the Pope had no power, for it was no *religious* bond.

The Romish bishops, however, are bound to the Pope by an oath from which he is sure not to free them: they have to swear in their consecration to *augment* the Pope's power as far as they can, and also to *persecute heretics* to the best of their ability. Happily they are not allowed in this country to carry out the principle laid down in their instructions to theological candidates, namely, that one ground of Luther's condemnation was his *heresy* 'that it is contrary to the mind of the Spirit to burn heretics.' This is still reprinted with approbation at Rome.

'With an ever-advancing courage, they (the Jansenists) matured a doctrine on the subject of the Church, which ran counter to the Roman on that point; nay, under

many Roman Catholics, and amongst them the Augustinian opinions had been widely spread, insomuch that at the end of the seventeenth century the Roman Catholics of Holland were apparently regarded as mostly Jansenists. Their numbers were then estimated at 330,000. Amongst them many from France had settled. In a Protestant country the efforts of the Jesuits were impotent in seeking to raise up open persecution; they used other means; they sought to stifle all Jansenism by using the authority of Rome against the local ecclesiastical superiors. Let but the Roman Catholics of Holland be placed under the direction of persons devoted to the policy of the Jesuits and the Court of Rome, and then all would be done.

Holland had formerly belonged to the diocese of Utrecht, a see founded by the English missionary St. Willebrord in 696. The bishop was a suffragan of the Archbishop of Cologne, whose province comprised most countries from the Weser to the Scheldt. Utrecht had been a locality of no small importance in the history of the labours of the English missionaries; it was to them a kind of starting point for those further operations which they at length carried into most of heathen Germany.

At the time of the Reformation it was generally found that Protestant truth extended most widely in those countries where the episcopal sees were but few; it thus became a part of the papal policy to increase the number of prelates by subdividing the archiepiscopal provinces and forming new dioceses.

To this end, in 1559, Pope Paul IV. (the Pope under whom the Marian persecution in England was carried on) separated Holland from the province of Cologne, erecting Utrecht into an archbishopric with five suffragans, whose sees were Haarlem, Deventer, Leuwarden, Groningen, and Middelburg.

After the establishment of Protestantism in the seven united provinces which had cast off the Spanish yoke, the archbishops of Utrecht still continued, though under other names, to exercise their spiritual authority over the Roman Catholics still in Holland. The suffragan bishops ceased to be appointed.

The two chapters of Utrecht and Haarlem still continued; and the former supplied the vacancies of the archbishopric by election from time to time, and, *sede vacante*, the chapter governed canonically by the appointment of vicars-general.

The archbishops thus elected by the chapter of Utrecht were duly confirmed by the Pope, and they bore the nominal title of

under the safeguard of a Protestant government, they gave effect forthwith to their idea. There arose an archiepiscopal church at Utrecht, which held itself to be in general Catholic, yet withal absolutely independent of Rome, and waged an incessant warfare against the Jesuit ultramontane tendency.'—RANKE, b. viii.

some

some bishopric *in partibus infidelium*; they were accredited by the Pope as his vicars-apostolic in Holland, as well as filling up the see of Utrecht. This (as a mere formal point) had to do with the jurisdiction exercised by the archbishop in the vacant dioceses of his province.

The Jesuits endeavoured in Holland, as elsewhere, to get power and influence into their own hands. They opposed the archbishops in many ways, professing that they acted in Holland as missionaries dependent only on the Pope and the general of their order. While Sasbold-Vosmer administered the diocese of Utrecht as vicar-general, *sede vacante*, they revolted against his authority; they continued their revolt when he was elected and consecrated archbishop, under the borrowed title of Archbishop of Philippi. They acted still worse in the time of Archbishop Rovenius; and, when questions respecting Jansenism arose, they took a place of yet more determined opposition to those prelates of Utrecht who maintained the doctrines of grace.

In 1661 M. de Neercassel was elected by the chapter to the vacant see, and consecrated under the title of Bishop of Castoria: in many respects he stood in close connection with the persecuted Jansenists in France; several of whom, Dr. Arnauld himself for one, found in his episcopate a refuge in Holland.

On his death, in 1686, the two chapters of Utrecht and Haarlem jointly chose as his successor M. Van Heussen, whom he had particularly desired as his coadjutor. Difficulties, however, were raised at Rome. The Jesuits wished the Pope to appoint a prelate of *their* selection; to this the chapters refused to submit; they reassembled, and forwarded to the Pope the names of *three* others, together with that of M. Van Heussen, leaving to him to select one of the four: from this list he chose M. Codde, who was consecrated in 1689 as Archbishop of Sebaste.

The name of this archbishop is often met with in the proceedings against the Jansenists, especially in connection with Father Quesnel, and others of similar sentiments who had taken refuge in Holland. Of course the Jesuits were not idle; Archbishop Codde was personally opposed in Holland, and accusations against him were transmitted to Rome. The papal court durst not *cite* the archbishop as an accused person; in that case it would have been needful to produce three things—the accusers, the charge, the witnesses. Rome took another path; Codde was *invited* to Rome,* and when he arrived he was treacherously detained there for *three years* in defiance of all canonical regulations. He de-

* Had he declined the *invitation* he would have immediately been charged with contumacy

manded to know *who* were his accusers; but this demand was in vain. When in ecclesiastical proceedings strict forms of justice are set aside under the pretence of paternal dealing, brotherly investigation, and the like, then the door is opened for almost any kind of dishonesty and tyranny; the maxim of law, *Potior est conditio negantis*, is reversed, and the accused or calumniated party has to prove his innocence, instead of the accusers having, as required by every law divine (Matt. xviii. 16; 2 Cor. xiii. 1; 1 Tim. v. 19; Deut. xvii. 6), civil and canon, to prove every allegation by sufficient testimony.*

The detention of Archbishop Codde at Rome was simply a means of crushing the Church of Utrecht, and bringing it entirely into the hands of the Pope and the Jesuits. The Pope appointed Theodore de Cock Vicar-Apostolic in Holland instead of Archbishop Codde: this prelate then, finding all his tarrying at Rome had been useless, made his escape and returned to Holland.

In his absence the Jesuits had not been idle; they had introduced a schism which has continued: many of the Roman Catholics in Holland had joined the Jesuit and papal party, and from that time they have opposed the Jansenist prelates. Archbishop Codde endeavoured to move Pope Clement XI., but this was of course in vain. He was still archbishop of the see of Utrecht, although no longer the vicar-general of the Pope. Believing, however, that he was *personally* the object of attack, and that the Church of Utrecht might still enjoy tranquillity if he were to withdraw, he took this step, allowing the chapters of Utrecht and Haarlem to appoint vicars-general to administer the government in his stead. The papal nuncio at Cologne, Piazza, however announced that *he* had received the commission from the Pope to exercise this authority. Against this claim the chapters appealed and protested.

At the death of Archbishop Codde, in 1710, it devolved on the chapters to elect a successor; this step, however, was not taken at once, because they still endeavoured, without compromise, to arrange the differences with the Court of Rome; they also saw, probably, that there were no means at that time of obtaining consecration for the archbishop whom they might elect. They continued, therefore, to appoint vicars-general; and, finding it hopeless to obtain a hearing at Rome, the chapter of Utrecht, in May, 1719, appealed to the next general council that might be held, and soon after the chapter of Haarlem took the same step.

* 'It was the policy of the Cardinal to lay aside the strict forms of justice, which afford protection to the accused, and to treat the matter as an affair of administration between a superior and his inferior;—a convenient method, as it leaves the fullest scope to the exercise of arbitrary power.'—MERLE (D'AUBIGNÉ), *Hist. Ref.*, i. 456.

Meanwhile

Meanwhile the canonical rights of the two chapters had been recognized by many in the Church of Rome in high station and consideration. The growing opposition to the wickedness of the Jesuits, and the issuing of the bull *Unigenitus*, which so many would not receive because it contradicts some of the first principles of Christian verity, led to much sympathy for those who held Jansenist sentiments.

At length the chapter of Utrecht took more decided steps. On the death of Clement XI. they hoped that his successor, Innocent XIII., would do them justice, and take a different course from his predecessor. They wrote to him on the 11th of June, 1721, requesting that no difficulties might be thrown in the way of their electing a person so as canonically to fill the vacant see. To this letter they received *no reply*, and when they wrote again, September 30, 1722, the same *judicious* silence was maintained. The chapter, thus left without any reply from Rome, determined to proceed to a canonical appointment; accordingly, April 27, 1723, Cornelius Steenhoven was elected Archbishop of Utrecht. The chapter and the archbishop elect both wrote to the Pope to notify the appointment, and to pray for his confirmation. These letters, as well as two more which the chapter subsequently sent, remained unanswered. The chapter then addressed a circular letter to all the bishops, and especially to those in neighbouring dioceses, on whom the responsibility of consecration devolved in accordance with ancient canons. They also addressed the conclave of cardinals assembled for the election of a new Pope after the death of Innocent XIII.; of this some notice was taken, for Spinelli, the internuncio at Brussels, published a letter prohibiting the neighbouring bishops from taking a part in consecrating the archbishop elect.

After the conclave had chosen Benedict XIII. as Pope, the chapter of Utrecht wrote to him in August, 1724: they in vain waited for an answer for more than three months.

Confirmation from Rome, and consecration at the hands of neighbouring bishops, had been sought alike fruitlessly; and, as the chapter deemed *succession* indispensable to the maintenance of the Church, they applied to the Bishop of Babylon *in partibus*, Dominic VARLET, who, after having been driven unjustly and informally from the sphere where he had exercised his episcopal functions as a vicar-apostolic, had taken refuge in Holland; in that country he was highly esteemed, and well known as an upholder of those Christian verities which were contradicted by the fatal bull *Unigenitus*. This appears to have been the ground of his persecution by the Court of Rome.

The Bishop of Babylon complied with the request, and consecrated

crated Archbishop Steenhoven in his own chapel at Amsterdam, October 15, 1724. All the parties concerned formally wrote to the Pope to notify to him what had been done: the papal court at length broke silence, and issued three damnatory and excommunicatory *briefs*.

Archbishop Steenhoven continued to occupy the see of Utrecht for but a very short time; he only lived to protest against the *brief* issued by the Pope, and to appeal to a future general council. After his death, April 3, 1725, the chapter elected Johannes Cornelius Barchman Wuytiers, who had been one of the vicars-general *sede vacante*. After the same notifications as had been given on a former occasion, the archbishop elect was consecrated by the Bishop of Babylon, a step which was followed, as before, by a condemnatory *brief* from the Pope. This led to new appeals to the next general council, and especially to a declaration of the Bishop of Babylon, vindicating his proceedings in perpetuating the episcopal order in Holland, and in consecrating *alone* without a papal authority for that purpose. He also solemnly appealed against the bull *Unigenitus*, and against the act of suspension promulgated against himself, which bore the name of the Bishop of Ispahan.^b Archbishop Barchman and his clergy also formally appealed against the bull *Unigenitus*.

This new archbishop received letters of communion from many bishops; of these, more than a hundred are preserved in the archives of the church at Utrecht. His opposition to the proceeding of the Jesuits, in enforcing the bull *Unigenitus*, made many prelates feel that they and he had an important cause in common. The Jesuits made Archbishop Barchman an object of their especial attack, and to him it is no small testimony that he was so opposed by such men.

We may pass by the details of a *miracle* said to have been wrought by this archbishop, in healing a young woman at Amsterdam in 1727. We need only remark—first, that the *faith* is stated to have been in the person healed, and the archbishop was only passive in the transaction; second, that her desire was, not that she might be freed from her distressing maladies, so much as that there might be a divine attestation to the cause of the archbishop, and his appeal against the doctrines of the bull *Unigenitus*; third, that the miracle was believed by Protestants, as well as by others. Of the one hundred and sixty attesting witnesses, *thirty* were Protestants.

This archbishop regulated the seminary at Amersfoort for the

^b How strange it is to meet with the names of these *Asiatic* prelates, in connection with proceedings in Holland.

training of priests; the Bible and biblical instruction form an important part in the course of study. He published a charge in 1730, condemnatory of the legend of Pope Gregory VII.: this, of course, would be considered as a new offence in the eyes of the court of Rome.

In 1733 Archbishop Barchman died, aged forty-one years. The chapter shortly after elected M. Vander Croon, who (after notifications to Rome as before) was consecrated by the Bishop of Babylon. This step was, of course, followed by an excommunication, which has this peculiarity—that it assumes as true a notorious error, that the chapter of Utrecht had become extinct, and therefore it could not elect.

The new archbishop, seeing the obstinacy of the Court of Rome, judged that it would be needful to re-establish the suffragan bishoprics of the province of Utrecht, in order that the succession of prelates might become possible. He died, however, in 1739, without carrying this step into execution.

Archbishop Meindaarts, who succeeded him, was consecrated, as before, by the Bishop of Babylon; and after the death of his consecrator (who had thus singularly perpetuated episcopacy in Holland), he himself restored the suffragan see of Haarlem in 1742, and that of Deventer in 1758.

An account of these proceedings was transmitted by Archbishop Meindaarts to Pope Benedict XIV. In this he shows what the conduct of the Jesuits had been in opposing the Church of Utrecht, because of its attachment to the doctrines of St. Augustine, and its horror at the corrupted morality of the Jesuits.

The archbishop and his two suffragans, with several priests, held in September, 1763, the *council of Utrecht*, for the consolidation of ecclesiastical doctrine and discipline.

After occupying the see for twenty-eight years, Archbishop Meindaarts died in 1767. His successor was Van Nieuwen Huysen, consecrated at the beginning of the following year by the two suffragans of his province. A fresh excommunication against all three followed, of course, from the Jesuitically-inclined Pope Clement XIII.

On the death of Archbishop Van Nieuwen Huysen in 1797, Van Rhin was elected to succeed him, and, occupied as Pope Pius VI. then was, in consequence of the condition of Italy, he nevertheless issued a brief of excommunication. Pius VII. took similar steps in an early part of his pontificate, when Archbishop Van Rhin filled up the two suffragan sees which had become vacant by death.

In 1808 Archbishop Van Rhin died; and just as the chapter of Utrecht was on the point of proceeding to elect a successor,
the

the minister of Louis Buonaparte, then King of Holland, interposed a prohibition 'until the organization of public worship in the kingdom of Holland.' The chapter then appointed vicars-general Gilbert de Jong, Bishop of Deventer, and Willibrord Van Os, president of the seminary of Amersfoort. The chapter in vain applied for permission to proceed to a canonical election. It was evident that King Louis was planning to fill the vacant sees by prelates of his own nomination, just as the civil power ordinarily appoints in most Roman Catholic countries.* After Napoleon had incorporated Holland into his empire, the chapter took occasion, on his visit to Utrecht, October 6, 1811, to represent the condition in which affairs stood. He gave a very definite reply, that he intended to nominate all the bishops of Holland himself (as he did in France), and that he would arrange with the Pope to that end. Napoleon, it should be remembered, was at this very time *excommunicated* by the Pope! As the Bishop of Haarlem had died in 1810, the *succession* depended wholly on the life of the Bishop of Deventer, De Jong: the death of this prelate would have extinguished all means of filling the sees, except through an accommodation with the Pope. For this apparently Napoleon waited.

As soon, however, as the French usurpation over Holland terminated, the chapter of Utrecht elected the vicar-general, Willibrord Van Os, to fill the archbishopric: he was consecrated by the Bishop of Deventer on the 24th of April, 1814.^d On this occasion, Pius VII. fulminated a new brief of excommunication.

The new archbishop soon supplied the vacancy in the see of Haarlem, by the appointment and consecration of Johannes Bon; through the influence of Cardinal Ercole Gonsalvi, the Pope's secretary of state, this new bishop was not excommunicated. This was a remarkable exception to the course which Rome took on these occasions.

* This is a *fact* worthy of notice. It is in vain for Romanists to talk grandiloquently about their bishops being elected by the clergy and instituted by the Pope; election is now a strange and rare thing. In a *concordat*, such for instance as that entered into by Pius VII. with Napoleon Buonaparte, the appointment is *absolutely* given to the civil power; and though the act of canonical institution must be the Pope's, yet he virtually conceded the right of rejecting the person so nominated; he thus became the mere instrument of the civil power. The papal court is willing to take a place of abject servility, so different from the pretensions of Gregory VII. or Innocent III., in order to accomplish its own ends the more surely. It will make no *doctrinal* concession, but anything else may be arranged on a system of expediency. They apply this same system of expediency to their mode of treating heretics: if the heretics be so numerous that it would be *unsafe* to persecute them, then they are permitted to abstain for the present. We live under one of these intervals.

^d It is instructive to see what a different thing was religious *liberty* under Napoleon from that enjoyed under Protestant rule.

In 1824 Gilbert de Jong, Bishop of Deventer, through whom the succession had been continued, died; and before William Vet, his appointed successor, had been consecrated, Archbishop Van Os also deceased, February 28, 1825, at the age of eighty-one years.

Bishop Bon, of Haarlem, was thus left the only prelate in the Dutch sees, and his first care was to consecrate William Vet to fill the bishopric of Deventer. The chapter of Utrecht named Johannes Van Santen vicar-general of the diocese, and June 14, 1825, they elected him Archbishop of Utrecht; he was consecrated by Bishop Bon, assisted by Bishop Vet; Cornelius de Jong, dean of the chapter of Utrecht, being regarded as representing a third bishop, so as in some sort to meet canonical regulations.*

Although Bishop Bon had not been excommunicated by the Pope at his own consecration, yet these new proceedings brought forth new denunciations from Rome; the ancient *animus*, as well as the *modus operandi*, continued the same.

As a specimen of the excommunicatory denunciations, we may insert that which was fulminated against William Vet, Bishop of Deventer:—

‘To our very dear children, the Catholics residing in Holland, Leo XII. Pope, health and the apostolic benediction.

‘Long has the Catholic Church been troubled by the schism of Utrecht. What is there that the Supreme Pontiffs, our predecessors, have not done to remedy this pernicious evil? But, by the inscrutable judgment of God, they have not succeeded, either by salutary counsel or by their respectful exhortations, nor yet by the threat and the application of canonical penalties, in bringing back into the way of salvation men who have been blinded, and in recalling them to the bosom of their mother, the holy Church.

‘William Vet, who dares to call himself Bishop of Deventer, and who has had the hardihood to inform us of his election and consecration, in a letter which he wrote us on the thirteenth of June last, has

* In the narrative of the succession of the Archbishops of Utrecht, it repeatedly occurs that even one prelate alone consecrated, who considered that he was justified in doing this by the ‘necessity of the case.’ The canonical number of bishops to act in consecrating is *three*; if, however, there be not this number, an *irregularity* merely is incurred: ‘*fieri non debet, factum valet*.’ When Bishop Lucifer, of Cagliari, alone consecrated Paulinus to the see of Antioch, although the act was deemed highly reprehensible (on various accounts), yet it was not doubted that Paulinus was thus made a real bishop. It is useless to search for directions in Scripture on the subject, for the subject is one on which the Scripture gives no directions.

In excommunicating the bishops of Holland, the Pope never denies that they had been consecrated as such, although he denies the validity of their *election*: he *suspends* them from exercising their functions as bishops: he similarly recognizes the *orders* which they confer, by *interdicting* those whom they have ordained from *using* their functions.

given us a recent example of such determined obstinacy. His letter, it is true, is filled with honey, and avows respect and obedience towards us; but this same letter instructs us, also, how we should regard these feigned and long worn-out flatteries: for William shows himself involved in the same errors, opposed with the same obstinacy to the holy canons, and, in one word, defiled with all the pollutions with which his fellow-schismatics of Utrecht have been covered from the beginning. William, however, has not been afraid of setting them forth as full of innocence and exempt from wrong, and he has even pronounced eulogiums on them.

‘ Since, therefore, William differs in nothing from those whom our predecessors, after having exhausted the resources of their paternal tenderness, rightly believed they ought to punish, we, treading in their honourable footsteps, have resolved to cause him to feel the same censures; for we would not, dearly beloved children, that any one of you (in the midst of whom the schism of Utrecht insinuates itself, and lamentably devours souls), deceived by the illusions of these impostors, should follow them as good pastors, and should receive the deceitful voice of wolves that assume sheep’s clothing, the more easily to desolate, carry off, and slay the flock.

‘ Thus, then, we decree, by the apostolic authority wherewith we are invested, and we declare, that the election of William Vet to the see of Deventer is illicit, null, and void, and that his consecration is unlawful and sacrilegious. We EXCOMMUNICATE and ANATHEMATIZE the above-named William, and all those who have taken a part in his culpable election, and who have concurred by their authority, care, consent, or advice, whether to his election or his consecration.

‘ We decide, declare, and decree that they are separated from the communion of the Church as schismatics, and that as such they must be avoided; and further, that the said William is suspended from the exercise of the rights and functions which belong to the order of bishops; and we interdict him under the penalty of incurring excommunication *ipso facto*, and without any other declaration, from making the holy chrism, conferring the sacrament of confirmation, conferring orders, or doing any other acts proper to the order of bishops: farther declaring null and void to all intents and purposes, all and singular the acts which he may have the hardihood to undertake.

‘ Let those, who have received ecclesiastical orders from him, know that they are bound by suspension, and that they incur irregularity received.

‘ It is with regret and much sorrow that we lay these penalties on the guilty. Oh! if they were themselves struck, and plunged into sorrow by our decree—if they should weep and repent, what joy should we not feel? What tears of joy would a conversion so much desired draw forth from our eyes! With what transport should we embrace these children returning to their father! What thanksgivings should we render to the God of mercy! We daily seek from him, in ardent prayers, that he would grant this consolation to us and to all the Church.

Church. Do the same, dearly beloved children—you, whose invincible faith and indestructible union with the holy apostolic see, the centre of orthodox unity, we so justly know and commend. To assist you to fulfil more willingly, more fully, and more joyfully, this duty of evangelic clarity, we affectionately bestow on you the apostolic benediction.

‘Given at Rome, at St. Peter’s, under the seal of the fisherman, the 19th (*query*, 25th) of August, 1825, in the second year of our Pontificate.’

Such was the form of the Papal censure, as used against any of the prelates of Holland; the only change made from time to time related to the circumstantial points, such as dates and names.

The yearnings of heart which the Pope expresses are among the frequent instruments of ecclesiastical tyranny; they are in themselves holy and gracious words, but which have been *habitually* used by those who have falsely assumed to *themselves* the place of Diotrefes (3 John, 9, 10), and have *themselves* been the causes of divisions and offences (Rom. xvi. 17).

‘The Pope in the opening paragraph speaks of the schism of Utrecht having long ‘troubled the Catholic Church.’ Ahab also charged Elijah the prophet with *troubling* Israel. But, indeed, the Romish church has found the Jansenists a sore thorn in their sides. Thus did Dr. Wiseman (now a cardinal and archbishop in the Romish church) preach at Clapham, on Friday, Aug. 2, 1850:—‘St. Alphonsus was necessary for an age when all things were infected with a JANSENISTIC spirit—when confession was made repulsive and difficult, instead of persons being drawn to it as the balm of a wounded spirit Persons now-a-days can happily have no experience of what confession was before St. Alphonsus—what a harsh and bitter thing JANSENISM had made it, and how severe were the external penances enjoined. He has so changed the face of the Church [can she then be *semper eadem*?], that now there is perhaps not a theological school in the world which would care to give its students any treatise of moral theology opposed to the spirit of St. Alphonso, gentle to past sins, severe to the occasion of them.’

How, then, had Jansenism modified *confession*? St. Cyran and Dr. Arnould taught the necessity of real heartfelt penitence *before God*, sorrow for having offended Him. They maintained that confession of sin to a priest was utterly in vain, so long as the *heart* was determined to go on in the same sins. Of course this was a harsh doctrine to those who held that sorrow for having offended God was needless, and that a man might be saved (his sins being removed by priestly absolution) ‘without having once loved God in his life.’

This St. Alphonso Liguori, who softened all this, was canonized in 1839. The acts of his canonization certify that there was ‘nothing censurable in anything that St. Alphonso Liguori had written.’

These writings, however, especially his ‘moral theology,’ soften down *sin* in such a way as to deaden the conscience. All true ideas of the *sin* of *lying*, *theft*, and other *gross* vices, are rooted out. In his approved writings he continually cites as *authorities* Lessius, Sanchez, Vasquez, Suarez, and others of the immoral casuists whom Pascal exposed in his *Lettres Provinciales*. It is marvellous that the modern Romish authorities should bring these very dogmas anew into light: they must presume that Pascal and the Jansenists are forgotten.

On their own principles of immorality they can deny all these allegations, even though we have them in their own books printed before our eyes. However, ‘God is not mocked,’ and His word has declared of the heavenly city, that ‘*without* are liars . . . and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie.’

It was a singular proceeding to *excommunicate* and *anathematize* Bishop Vet first, and then to *threaten* him with excommunication if he did certain acts. It is like menacing with death a man already slain.

In reply to the allegations of this brief against the Prelates of Holland, it was answered :—

‘ With what have our predecessors been charged ?

‘ History teaches us :—

‘ 1st. That they would not subscribe the formulary of Alexander VII. against Jansenius.

‘ 2nd. That they would not receive the constitution *Unigenitus* of Clement XI. against Father Quesnel.

‘ 3rd. That they would not consent to the destruction of their Church, but have perpetuated the episcopate in the United Provinces of Holland.

‘ This is what the brief does not express distinctly, and this is what it contains implicitly.

‘ The Bishops of Holland have victoriously replied to these pretended complaints.

‘ As to the first article, they have said that it is solely through tenderness of conscience that they and their clergy have not been willing, and still are not willing, to affirm with imprecation that five propositions are in the *Augustinus* of Jansenius, Bishop of Ypres ; since after having read that work they are not found there ; and nevertheless that they have always offered to condemn these five propositions, making the distinction of “ fact ” and “ right.”

‘ As to the second article, they state that it is from attachment to the Christian faith that they have not been willing, and that they still are not willing to receive the constitution “ *Unigenitus* ; ” because the one hundred and one propositions which this bull condemns, as extracted from the *Réflexions Morales* of Father Quesnel, belong to the sacred deposit of the Faith, and this would be compromised were we to receive a bull which visibly condemns the faith of the Church, the language of holy Fathers, and tradition.

‘ As to the third article, they say that in perpetuating the episcopate in Holland, the Chapter of this country have only done, and still do, what was always done in the Church during the first fifteen centuries : when bishops were nominated by the clergy and the people, ordained by the bishops of the ecclesiastical provinces, and instituted by the metropolitan.’

When the Pope, January 13th, 1826, excommunicated Archbishop Van Santen, he, with his two suffragan bishops, issued a circular ‘ To all the Bishops of the Catholic Church,’ intreating them to seek to bring the Pope to another course of action. They also addressed a declaration to all Catholics, clerical and lay, reciting the mode in which they had been treated, and renewing their appeal to a future General Council.

In

In this declaration they gave an account of the intercourse in 1823, which Archbishop Van Os and his suffragans sought to hold with Monsignor Nazalli, who had been sent by the Pope into Holland to arrange, if possible, the terms of a *Concordat* with the Protestant King who then ruled both Holland and Belgium.

The archbishop, then eighty years of age, with the two other bishops, went to the Hague, and requested an audience of the Nuncio. They made an application by letter, but the only reply was a preliminary demand that they should blindly and absolutely submit themselves to the Pope. Farther correspondence followed, but still no interview was granted. At length two of the Jansenist clergy had an interview with Belli, the secretary to the Nuncio; this led to a new demand as to what the Papal authorities required them to subscribe; the terms were made yet more strong:—

‘I, the undersigned, declare that I submit myself to the apostolic constitution of Pope Innocent X., dated May 31st, 1653, as well as to the constitution of Pope Alexander VII., dated October 16, 1656; also to the constitution of Clement XI., which commences with these words: *Vineam Domini Sabaoth*, dated July 16th, 1705. I reject and condemn with my whole heart the five propositions extracted from the book of Cornelius Jansenius, in the sense intended by the author, the same in which the Holy See has itself condemned them in the above-named constitutions. I farther submit myself, without any distinction, mental qualification, or explanation, to the constitution of Clement XI., dated September 8th, 1713, beginning with the word *Unigenitus*. I accept it purely and simply, and thereto I swear:—So help me God and this holy Gospel.’

These terms could not be accepted, and, of course, the Papal authorities would modify nothing; and the Jansenist clergy plainly told them ‘that they had learned by instances drawn from ecclesiastical history, such as those of Popes Stephen VII., Sergius III., Gregory II., John XXII., and some others, how true was the testimony thus expressed by Pope Adrian VI.: It is certain that the Pope is fallible,^s even in a matter of faith, when he sustains heresy by decree or command: for many of the Popes of Rome have been heretics.’

Belli only insisted on *implicit submission*, confirmed by an oath that they believed certain things which the secretary, the nuncio, and the Pope all *knew* full well that they did not believe. And

^s Here is a difficulty for a maintainer of papal infallibility:—Assumed—that the Pope is infallible,—then Adrian VI. was infallible;—but he taught that the Pope is fallible. Perhaps, then, we may conclude that, on papal authority, it is infallibly true that the Pope is fallible.

yet the only thing that Rome sought from them was perjured hypocrisy.

As to the bull *Unigenitus*, they could well reply that this very bull had not been received in Belgium so long as it continued under the Austrian rule; and that much as the Jesuits had laboured, they had failed even yet in obtaining that it should be received as authoritative amongst *all* Roman Catholics.

The demands made on the Bishops of Holland by the Secretary of the Nuncio Nazalli had the effect of showing the Protestant King of Holland that no *Concordat* with the Pope would be practicable which involved the submission of the Jansenists to such claims. These proceedings also led to almost as much recognition of the Jansenist bishops by the Government as the *Roman* Catholic prelates of Belgium received.

The declaration to all Catholics ends with a solemn *appeal* from the bulls of Pope Leo XII., from all similar briefs, from the penal sentences thus expressed, as *unlawful, unjust, null, and void*; they farther appealed from all the acts of injustice (which they had recited), and from each one in particular already exercised or yet to be exercised towards them, TO THE NEXT GENERAL COUNCIL, lawfully convoked, to which they might have free access: 'commending (they say) our persons, our state, and our rights to the Divine protection, to that of the universal Church, and of the said General Council; and reserving to ourselves the right of renewing such an *appeal* at such place and time, and before such an authority, as we shall judge to be fitting.'

Thus ended the transactions with Romish authorities at the commencement of the episcopacy of the present Archbishop of Utrecht; of course Rome has not withdrawn her demands since; and as to the *General Council*, to which the appeal is reserved, we may probably wait *ad calendas Græcas*.

The following has been the order of the Archbishops of Utrecht from the time of the rupture with Pope Clement XI.:—

CODDE, consecrated February 6, 1689, under the title of Archbishop of Sebaste; died 1710.

Sedis vacatio, 1710-23.

STEENHOVEN, elected April 27, 1723; consecrated October 15, 1724; died April 3, 1725.

BARCHMAN, elected May 15, 1725; consecrated September 30, 1725; died May 13, 1733.

VANDER-CROON, elected July 22, 1733; consecrated October 28, 1734; died January 4, 1739.

MEINDAARTS, consecrated October 18, 1739. [These four archbishops were all consecrated by Varlet, Bishop of Babylon.] Archbishop Meindaarts restores the bishopric of Haarlem, 1742,

and

and that of Deventer, 1758 ; holds the Council of Utrecht 1763 ; dies October 31, 1767.

VAN NIEUWEN HUYSEN, elected November 19, 1767 ; consecrated February 7, 1768, by the Bishops of Haarlem and Deventer ; died April 14th, 1797.

VAN RHIN, consecrated July 5, 1797, by the two suffragans ; died June 24, 1808.

Sedis Vacatio, 1808-14.

VAN OS, elected February 10, 1814 ; consecrated April 24, 1814, by Gilbert de Jong, Bishop of Deventer (the only surviving Dutch Bishop) ; died February 28, 1825.

VAN SANTEN, elected June 14, 1825 ; consecrated November 15, 1825, by the two suffragans.

Such is a brief outline of the external framework of the Church of the Jansenists in Holland ; the form in which their existence has been maintained for a century and a half.

There are many reflections which must occur to a Protestant reader. Had the Jansenists really rejected the vain idea of union with Rome, how much more light might they not have received from the word of God ; had they really examined *what* claim Rome has on their *consciences*, might it not have freed them from holding doctrines, and perpetuating observances, which can hardly by any mode of argumentation be so explained away as not to clash with the Gospel of Christ ?

It is not undervaluing the light possessed by the Jansenists, nor is it depreciating their sufferings and trials, when we feel and express regret that they did not take a further stand ; and when they saw that Rome was utterly fallible in points of *faith*, they did not boldly and at once renounce *all* her claims. 'No lie is of the truth.'

We may thus reflect and thus ponder the path of the Jansenists ; and may we not, in doing this, humbly inquire whether the superior light possessed by Protestants has been as truly followed, and whether we have as steadfastly acted on the measure of truth which God has vouchsafed to us. Whatever we see of practical inconsistency in the Jansenists may instruct us, and may teach us how gentle we should be in our judgments of those in whom there may appear to be contradictions blended. Many Christians hold firmly the precious truths of the Gospel of Christ, and yet from a reverence for *authority* may mentally hold not a few things which contradict those very truths. There will be a day for the people of Christ, when they shall see the truth of God in its fulness together—when they shall know even as they are known.

§ III.—A VISIT TO ARCHBISHOP VAN SANTEN, OF UTRECHT.

[*The following Notes of a Visit paid to the Archbishop of Utrecht in September, 1850, may be considered a suitable Supplement to the previous account of the Jansenists, as furnishing recent intelligence.*]

In visiting Utrecht I particularly wished to obtain some information with regard to the Jansenists, who have their archiepiscopal see in that city. The measure of knowledge in England respecting actual existing Jansenists is but meagre; and in fact not a few who have some acquaintance with the labours and persecutions of the Port Royalists are wholly unaware that any Jansenists still exist.

I informed Professor Royaards of my desire to see something of the Jansenists, and he gave me a note of introduction to Johannes van Santen, their present Archbishop of Utrecht, of whom he spoke in high terms as an excellent and truly Christian old man.

The same evening I went to the abode of the archbishop. I found him a kind, courteous gentleman, nearly seventy-eight years old; and he seemed pleased at finding that any in England took an interest in the history of the Jansenists, their testimony, trials, and persecutions.

We conversed on various particulars connected with their history, especially from the time of the condemnation of the writings of Quesnel by the bull 'Unigenitus,' a step on the part of Pope Clement XI. which separated the Jansenists *doctrinally* from Rome more definitely than before.

The name of Jansenist is not one which they themselves acknowledge, although they do not consider that it implies any reproach; they regard themselves, however, as holding the doctrines of the Catholic Church, as set forth in the writings of St. Augustine, and which the Church of Rome *once* maintained in opposition to Pelagian and semi-Pelagian errors.

The old archbishop was earnest in speaking of the importance of the doctrines of grace, for which the Jansenists have suffered so much: he seemed deeply to feel that the condition of man, as a lost sinner, is such by nature that every step in his recovery, from first to last, must be by the free grace of God; that just as God in free grace sent His blessed Son into the world to become man, and to bear our sins and to die in our stead, so too it is in the same grace that the Holy Ghost works on the soul, when *dead* in trespasses and sins, leading it to rely upon the blood of Christ, and thus to receive free forgiveness and acceptance. 'Efficacious
grace'

grace' was the expression on which he rested, as that which stated his feeling and judgment; it must be *grace*, that the glory of salvation may belong wholly to God; it must be *efficacious*, in order that it may fully avail in bestowing *eternal* life on him in whom it works.

How far the doctrines of grace are held in heart and conscience by the present Jansenists in general, I had no means of ascertaining; but with regard to the archbishop himself, it was evident that he really felt what he said, and that while he could indeed own the inability of man to do anything for his own salvation, he knew the blessedness of resting on the testimony which God has given concerning his Son.

The doctrinal points condemned by the bull 'Unigenitus' had, in his opinion, only a yet higher importance because they had thus been denied at Rome; and he lamented much that they were consequently denied in so large a part of Christendom, as this must be the case wherever that bull is received, and it appears now to be acknowledged amongst Roman Catholics in general. Archbishop van Santen gave me some curious accounts of the manner in which the authorities at Rome have from time to time endeavoured to induce the Jansenists to sign the formulary which acknowledges the five propositions to be contained in the Augustinus of Jansenius, and to receive the bull 'Unigenitus.'

These efforts seem, of late years, to have been especially made during the period when Holland and Belgium were united under one monarch. It was then regarded by Rome to be of especial importance fully to unite to herself all in the kingdom of the Netherlands who were not avowedly Protestants. About twenty-three years ago the papal nuncio, Cappucini, a man of no small ability and address, came into the Netherlands with full authority to regulate everything for the consolidation of the Roman Catholic Church.

Although the appointment of Archbishop van Santen had been (as usual) followed by a renewed excommunication by Rome, yet Cappucini sought to win him just as if no such hostile step had been taken. He invited Archbishop van Santen to a conference, with which he complied, as professing to accord to the Pope a *disciplinary* headship (at least in the Western Church), although he considered him to be in deep doctrinal error.

In the first conference Cappucini sought to cajole Van Santen by much of that kind of smooth flattery which an Italian priest knows so well how to use. He spoke much of the unity of the Church; of the deep interest felt at Rome amongst the papal authorities on account of the Jansenists; how they admired their firm adhesion to the 'Apostolical See,' in spite of all that had occurred

occurred in the last two centuries; how their steadfastness was only the more admirable in a country like Holland, with Protestants all around them; how firm a stand they had made against lax casuistry; and how much he hoped that no real difficulties might be found which would cause them to continue in any sense separated from the unity of the Catholic body.

As to Archbishop van Santen, personally, he was told by Cappucini how much his hopes rested on him, as a person so diligent in his attention to every canonical regulation—an attention shown (he said) in everything connected with his election, the notification to the holy see, his consecration, &c. In fact, the Pope would feel that he was quite an upholder of the authority of the Catholic Church in the Netherlands if the ‘slight differences’ could be arranged. Cappucini also spoke much of his personal qualities, his learning, character, and especially prudence, on which (he said) the Pope greatly relied as to the settlement and removal of every difficulty. Cappucini then appointed a time for another conference, which he hoped would be definitive.

At the second conference Cappucini began by again praising Van Santen as a person of extreme ‘regularity’ and prudence. He then went on to say that all the differences between the Jansenists and the see of Rome might be reduced to one small point, one little thing about which a person of such prudence and regularity as the archbishop could of course make no difficulty. Van Santen perfectly understood what the nuncio meant by the ‘one small point,’ and he said, ‘I see what you mean—the *formulary*.’ To this Cappucini was obliged to assent: the ‘one small point’ was that which had been the ground of such bitter persecutions and cruel sufferings.

The archbishop of course refused to sign the prescribed formulary, although the nuncio (who had been stopped in his flattering circumlocutions) pressed on him, ‘It is but a *form*; all that is asked is, that you will write your name on a slip of paper, and then all will be right.’ Van Santen replied indignantly, ‘A *form* has a meaning, and I cannot subscribe a document, and confirm it by the solemn obligation of an oath, unless I am certain in my conscience before God of the TRUTH of that to which I put my name.’

THE NUNCIO.—‘But you are bound in your conscience before God to acknowledge the authority of the holy father, and as his Holiness assures you of the truth of the formulary, that is sufficient to remove every scruple. Any doubt in your own mind is but a private opinion; while, on the other hand, you have the full authority of the Church both to *instruct* you that the formulary states what is true, and to *require* you to acknowledge this undoubted fact.’

VAN

VAN SANTEN.—‘I have read the Augustinus of Jansenius more than once through; I *know* that the five propositions, as condemned, are not contained in that book: how can I then, as an honest man and a Christian, subscribe a declaration as true which denies a simple fact? I have to do with God and my conscience, even if the Pope and the whole Church should be misinformed. As they cannot alter a *fact*, so they can have no authority from God to require me to sign my name to a declaration which contradicts a fact.’

The nuncio then sought to illustrate the Romish idea of submission in every respect to the holy see, so as to convince the archbishop that he was wrong. In this endeavour he used the following illustration:—‘You see, M. van Santen, that the table at which we are sitting is covered with a *green* cloth. Now, supposing that the father of a family were to prohibit his children absolutely from entering this room, or even looking into it—well, but if one of the children were to look in through the key-hole, and were thus by disobedience to acquire the knowledge that the cloth on the table is *green*, how then would the case stand? If the father were to make out an inventory of the furniture in the room, and if he were (whether by mistake or design, it matters not) to describe this *green* cloth as being *red*; and if he were, on the ground of his parental authority, to require each of his children, as relying on their father’s information, to subscribe this inventory as perfectly correct, it would not be competent to the child who had *seen* the cloth to act upon the knowledge he had gained by disobedience, and to refuse to subscribe the statement in which its colour was said to be *red*. The father had a right to forbid his children to look into the room; he had also a right to prescribe to his children what they should sign; and no act of prior disobedience on the part of any of them could take away the obligation of unhesitating compliance.’

ARCHBISHOP VAN SANTEN.—‘You have brought forward a curious illustration; but how would you apply it? and how would you vindicate, even in such a case, the subscription to a known untruth?’

CAPPUCINI.—‘There is no untruth at all supposed in the case that I have put: the child is absolutely bound to believe his parent, and as the only ground he could have for any scruple of conscience would be part of his sinful disobedience, he ought to say, The command of God requires me to obey my father; I must therefore obey him in this point which involves the sacrifice of my own opinion; and as I am bound in duty to God to declare my belief that the cloth is *red*, I may reasonably suppose that my eyes were mistaken when I saw it. Perhaps a sunbeam hindered
me

me from seeing the colour correctly, or perhaps, in punishment for my disobedience, an optical illusion was sent to deceive me : any of these considerations is enough to justify me fully in subscribing my full belief that the object is really *red*, and not *green*.'

ARCHBISHOP VAN SANTEN.—' But how do you apply the idea of *knowledge obtained through disobedience* to the question of fact involved in subscription to the formulary ?'

CAPPUCINI.—' Listen, that I may instruct you. You are well aware that no theological virtue shines more brightly than *implicit obedience* ; the Holy Scriptures, the fathers and doctors of the Church, and the practice of all the saints, so fully commend this virtue that there is no need for me to insist on it, at least in conferring with you. Obedience would require that the work of Jansenius, entitled *Augustinus*, should not be read, since it was condemned by the bull of Pope Urban VIII. (*In eminenti*). Any knowledge, therefore, which any person now has of the contents of that book must have been obtained through a transgression of that obedience to which he was bound. No one can have a right to know what the book contains any further than as relates to the condemned propositions, and that only from the constitution that condemns them ; you ought therefore, as a submissive child, not to insist on acting on the knowledge obtained through disobedience, but you should own with humility that in reading the condemned book you *may* have been mistaken ; nay, that you *must* have been mistaken—that God did not give you clear light when you were thus acting in presumption, so that all you have to do is to subscribe the formulary purely and simply, and receive the blessing which will result from giving up your own will, and thus have the satisfaction of restoring the peace of the Church.'

ARCHBISHOP VAN SANTEN.—' If the peace of the Church be in question, why does the Pope break it on the ground of a mere question of fact ? You have already described the subscription as a *form* merely, why then should such importance be attached to a *mere form* ?'

CAPPUCINI.—' I have *argued* the point simply to satisfy your scruples, and the illustrations which I used had no other end : I cannot suppose that you will obstinately maintain your own private opinion, especially when you remember that so many wise and learned men are agreed that the five propositions *are* in Jansenius.'

ARCHBISHOP VAN SANTEN.—' I do not wish to set my judgment above that of others ; I only ask, let the five condemned propositions be *shown* me in Jansenius, and let it be shown that they are there stated in the sense in which they were condemned ; that is,

not

not in the sense in which any thing similar is found in the works of St. Augustine: you know the formulary goes this length, and the Pope never professed to condemn St. Augustine, one of the fathers and doctors of the Church; and he could not condemn any propositions if they are taken in an orthodox sense, for instance, in that of St. Augustine.'

CAPPUCINI.—'It will not do for me to *argue* on points which only require simple submission: it is easy to misunderstand St. Augustine; and perhaps we should wander from the point if we were to inquire into his meaning on these deep subjects.'

ARCHBISHOP VAN SANTEN.—'But, with regard to the formulary, it is necessary for me to examine what St. Augustine has written, and what is contained in Jansenius; for you call on me to declare solemnly, that Jansenius has misrepresented the doctrine of St. Augustine: how can I declare this, if I do not know *what* the doctrine is, and *whether* it has been misrepresented or not?'

CAPPUCINI.—'Surely we may compose this slight difference: it is only by drawing refined distinctions of the sense in which words are taken, that you can object to subscribe. You do not know how earnest is the goodwill and sympathy of the Holy Father towards you; his paternal heart longs to welcome you as a returning child: surely you may believe him when he assures you that the meaning of certain propositions is that which the Church has defined them to be. You do not know in what favour many of your sentiments are with the Pope; for instance, the Church has never rejected the doctrine of "*efficacious grace*" which you esteem so highly: while this is not condemned, you see how every thing may be adjusted by merely your name being affixed to a form: a drop of ink and a few seconds would put all right. This is all that the Holy Father asks.'

ARCHBISHOP VAN SANTEN.—'Am I then to understand that his Holiness asks that in a solemn oath I should call God to witness that I do believe what I do not believe; what the Pope *knows* that I do not believe; what Almighty God, the searcher of hearts, knows that I do not believe? Is Catholic unity to be maintained by *perjury*—an awful sin before both God and man? And do you mean to say that if I knowingly commit this crime, it will be what the Pope desires and demands?'

CAPPUCINI.—'The Holy Father only requires that from you which lies in the province of his authority. When the Church instructs you *what* to believe, you are *bound* to silence all trifling scruples.'

ARCHBISHOP VAN SANTEN.—'I cannot conceal my INDIGNATION at your endeavours to make me declare, in the presence of Almighty God, that I do believe a point that I do NOT believe:
my

my conscience is subject to Him, and, by His aid, I will act in His fear. I must continue to refuse to put my name to a formula which I reject: my hand must not contradict my heart.'

The nuncio felt that this was decisive; the firmness of the archbishop was not to be overcome with sophistries which, even if they would pass current at Rome, would be of but little worth amongst any who understand what acting in the fear of God is, instead of in submission to the Pope.

Cappucini said no more about the differences being slight, or about the Church of Rome not rejecting the doctrine of 'efficacious grace;' the tone was quite changed. 'I have patiently endeavoured to convince you of your error, and thus by gentle means to lead back your wandering steps; I have not, therefore, referred to the position in which you *already* were standing, as having been for some time excommunicated by the Church. Your consecration as an archbishop is null and void, you are incapable of exercising any episcopal authority or jurisdiction; and yet the Holy See condescended to treat you as if these things were not so, in the cherished hope of restoring a wandering sheep; but, alas! all this condescending love has been rejected by your own presumption and obstinacy; and thus the sentence of solemn excommunication, so far from being removed, is only confirmed; the (so-called) consecration which you have received, and the pretended orders which you confer, are alike sacrilegious, and all who at all communicate with you are themselves schismatical and favourers of heresy, or even heretics themselves.^b Oh! that you would return to the one fold of Christ, out of which is no salvation; that you would not urge on to destruction the souls of others as well as your own!'

Such was Archbishop van Santen's account of the arguments of the Nuncio Cappucini; and then he said to me, 'I could smile at the terrors of excommunication which he thus placed before me, having so long known such sentences for as much as they are worth, *when given forth on such grounds*. I thought of the man born blind in the Gospel, who was excommunicated for owning that Jesus was of God, a sentence which *God* did not ratify; although it might seem from the law that the priests then had greater power than the successors of St. Peter could now claim' (see Deut. xvii. 10—12).

I asked the archbishop if he were aware that the Commentaries of *Victorinus* had been published at Rome with the full approbation of the censors of the press. He had not heard of this, and

^b What right-minded person can fail to see the oppressive character of a proceeding which makes one individual responsible for the alleged heresy of another?
was

was much interested in receiving from me some account of the manner in which Victorinus states as distinctly as possible the doctrines of grace: he agreed with me that it was surprising that such commentaries should be published from MSS. in the *Vatican*, at *Rome*, and (of course) 'with approbation.' Had a Protestant or Jansenist put them forth, what would have been heard but some outcry of fraud or deception? A cardinal for an editor is a good guarantee against all *such* charges on the part of opposers of the doctrines of grace.

I inquired how the present Jansenists act in the appointment of their prelates, and how they *now* regard the See of Rome. It seems that the idea of visible unity is still the bond which links them to the Roman Catholic Church, although that church itself repudiates the connection.

On the appointment of a bishop or archbishop they formally announce the circumstance to the Pope, praying for a confirmation; but all they receive is a renewed excommunication.

The archbishop gave me a little book,¹ containing some account of the archbishopric of Utrecht from the time of its severance from Rome. This volume is to me an interesting memento of the donor, as well as valuable on account of the curious information it contains.

I asked the archbishop how long they intended going on in this manner, and whether they ever expected to bring the Pope to a different mode of acting, and the Church of Rome to doctrinal soundness. To this he answered that he feared that every effort would be unavailing, but that still they must hold fast the unity of the Church, even if the Pope were never brought to reason.

I remarked, 'What a condition, then, the Church is in; how little is there of *real* unity! for what real unity can the Church have except in the truth of God: shall we ever find, then, the Church on earth united in truth and holiness, showing forth the praise of Christ her Saviour?'

He replied, 'I think from the Holy Scriptures that there will not be a united people of Jesus Christ upon earth until the coming of Elijah, and the conversion of the Jews as a nation. *They* are the people who shall glorify Him here: this is my opinion.'

These words were spoken softly and solemnly, almost whispered in my ear. I answered that perhaps I mostly agreed with him, but I might not fully comprehend his thoughts. I inquired, 'But

¹ 'Déclaration des Evêques de Hollande, adressée à toute l'Eglise Catholique, et Acte d'Appel des Bulles d'Excommunication lancées contre eux par Léon XII., les 25 Août, 1825, et 13 Janvier, 1826.' Paris, 1827.

do you not think the coming of Elijah will be the event which will introduce the second advent of Christ?’

He answered, ‘Certainly; for so the Scripture teaches.’

I then asked, ‘But when the Lord Jesus comes again, as is promised in the Scripture, what will take place? Will there be the resurrection of all men, the general judgment, and the destruction of all things? If so, how can the Jews be a nation on this earth glorifying the Lord?’

The archbishop replied with even deeper solemnity, ‘The Lord Jesus Christ shall be glorified on *this earth* where He once suffered; He is to reign (as it was promised) on the throne of His Father David. When He comes, some will rise, there will be the resurrection of His people, His faithful ones; for they shall all reign with Him. The Jews will be His people on earth when their sins are taken away; but the resurrection of all, and the end of all things, will not be till after this reign.’

I told him that I quite agreed with him as to these points; and then we looked together at many parts of the prophetic Scriptures; such as Zech. xii. and xiv., as showing that the Jews will be brought into extreme suffering when they have gone back to their own land in unbelief, and that *then* the Lord Jesus will come, they shall see Him whom they pierced, the spirit of grace and supplications shall be poured on them, and they shall know the efficacy of the fountain opened for sin and uncleanness in the shedding of the blood of Christ.

Another Scripture at which we looked was 2 Thes. ii., which speaks of the manifestation of the Antichrist—a *person* (as we both agreed) who shall reject the name and authority of God and of Christ, who shall lead others to do the same, whose power shall be at its height when the Lord Jesus shall come for the deliverance of His people, and the destruction of the oppressor. We turned to many passages which show *the infidel* character of the Antichrist; so that, let corrupted Christianity be as bad as it may, here is something worse—something, indeed, for which corrupt Christianity may prepare the way, but which goes farther in the denial of God. We conversed on the character and actings of Rome, as being fully calculated to introduce the Antichrist with all the deceivableness of his power, turning men’s minds away from the true grace of God and from his Scripture, so as to fit them for the reception of the great result of Satanic agency.^k

We

^k Some may be surprised that I should speak of the Antichrist not as being the Papacy, but something far worse.

It is said in Scripture of the Antichrist, that *all shall worship him whose names are not written in the Lamb's book of life*. Now really it is quite beyond my credulity

We spoke also of the consolation of those promises which tell us of the coming of Christ, and the heavenly blessedness with him which his people will then enjoy.

After thus referring to many Scriptures, the archbishop, who seemed astonished that an English stranger should thus accord with his thoughts and feelings, laid hold of my arm with both his hands, and earnestly addressed me : '*Monsieur ! si vous avez reçu une telle lumière de la parole de Dieu sur ces vérités, répandez-la, répandez-la dans votre pays, entre vos compatriotes !*'

He then offered to lend me some works, from which he had obtained much light on subjects of prophetic truth forty years ago. We went into his library, where (ascending a slight ladder with eager but tottering steps) he took down from a lofty shelf two volumes by the Père Lambert (printed at Paris in 1806), entitled *Exposition des Prédications et des Promesses faites à l'Eglise pour les derniers temps de la Gentilité*. He also lent me some volumes by the President Agier, containing expositions of prophecy ; but of these he did not speak so highly as he did of the works of the Père Lambert.

I returned with the volumes, and certainly found not a little in them in which I was interested. The views of the Père Lambert struck me as much more clear than those of Agier, although it was curious to remark, in the works of the latter, that he had made extensive use of the writings of Lacunza (otherwise *Ben Ezra*), years before they were introduced to the notice of English students of prophecy by Mr. Irving.

In again visiting the archbishop before my departure from Utrecht, to return his books and to take my leave of him, as I thought that he might be interested in learning what views have

dulity to imagine that there are *no wicked men* around us except Roman Catholics ; for so it must be if all except the elect of God own the Papacy.

I should also be repugnant to admit a theory which would necessarily exclude from salvation not only Pascal, Fenelon, Gaspar Contarini, Quesnel, and many others who owned the authority of Rome, but also Luther, Melancthon, Tyndale, and all the early reformers, who once had been in that communion. Had the Papacy been the Antichrist, none of these could have been saved ; for 'if any man worship the beast and his image, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone.'

When France rejected Popery, it was seen and felt that there was a form of evil far worse—ATHEISTIC ANARCHY. This is an answer to any who say, What form of Antichristianism can be worse than Popery ? I ask, Are we to learn *nothing* from the lessons which God brings before the eyes of men ? It is not sixty years since our fathers had this terrible display of evil before them, and is it possible that it has been already forgotten ?

I do not palliate Popery ; but, with all its evils, *some* have been saved within its nominal pale ; Antichristianism, on the contrary, leads all its votaries to inevitable destruction. Popery may do much in carrying out forms of iniquity, which will at length issue in the rejection of God and of Christ. There have been '*many Antichrists*,' but '*THE Antichrist*' will at length appear in his full infidel power.

been put forth by prophetic inquirers in other countries, I took with me *Pensées sur l'Apocalypse*, par B. W. Newton, a translation of an English work.^m I also gave him an English pamphlet of my own on a subject of prophecy;ⁿ although this latter is unintelligible to him, he accepted it, as some of his friends who are interested in prophecy know English.

I then took leave of Archbishop Van Santen, with feelings of no common kind. It is interesting to find in very varied circumstances, and with diverse measures of light, those who rest on the blood of Christ as the sole ground of their acceptance before God, and who trust to His grace alone. It is interesting to meet with persons in different paths, learning from the Word of God what the hope of the true Church is, the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the gathering together to Him of those who are His—the living that shall still remain, and all those who may have fallen asleep in the faith of His name.

This hope can sustain the heart of a believer, while he sees from the testimony of the Word how dark will be the anti-Christian period, which shall immediately precede the coming of Christ; and this hope can give him joy, when meditating on the path and sufferings of any of the sheep of Christ here. The brightness of that day will repay all; and then shall all, who, through the quickening power of the Holy Ghost, have believed in Christ as the Lamb without spot slain for sinners—whatever their names have been among men, whether Protestant, Jansenist,^o or aught besides—shall be gathered before the throne, one holy and happy company, amongst whom shall be no separations, no partings—all reflecting the brightness of the glory of Christ their Saviour, and all uniting in the song, 'Worthy is the Lamb that was slain!'

^m *Thoughts on the Apocalypse*. By B. W. Newton. Nisbet; Berners' Street, London.

ⁿ *The Man of Sin*, 2 Thess. ii. Nisbet; Berners' Street.

^o The following allusion to modern Jansenist schools in France may interest some:—

'We saw one of the "first fruits" of Allevard [a village near Grenoble] in the person of Coquand the barber, a Roman Catholic from his youth up, until within the last three years. He received his first light from a Bible sold to him by a Jansenist from Burgundy. . . The curés of the Isère call the Jansenists cousins-german of the Protestants, &c.'—*Circular of the Foreign Aid Society*, November, 1850, p. 3.

THE SEPTUAGINT.

An Apology for the Septuagint; in which its Claims to Biblical and Canonical Authority are briefly vindicated and stated.

By E. W. GRINFIELD, M.A., Editor of the Hellenistic Greek Testament. Pickering: London, 1850.

WE must confess that we have rarely read a book with less satisfaction than this, or with a stronger conviction of the pure and pious intentions of the writer. It excited our curiosity to investigate both the Hebrew text of the Holy Scriptures and the Greek version usually called the Septuagint, and to compare the original with the translation. We endeavoured to divest ourselves of all current opinions regarding the Greek version, and to search carefully for that which should be acknowledged as the result of impartial and independent study.

A Masoretic Hebrew Bible and a good edition of the Septuagint were all the books thought necessary for the investigation of the subject. After comparing Genesis, Exodus, several chapters of Leviticus, the Song of Solomon, the book of Esther, several Psalms, many chapters of Job and also of the greater and minor prophets, we found that our researches had led us to results diametrically opposed to those of Mr. Grinfield. It seemed to us that if we should concede anything like inspiration to the translators of the Greek version, we might also, without any hesitation, allow it to Luther, Calvin, the English version, or any modern or ancient translation.

The outward observances which the LXX.^a or LXXII. men who came from Jerusalem to Alexandria paid to current ceremonies,^b

^a We do not enter into the disputed question whether 70 or 72 came from Jerusalem to translate the law, or whether there came any one from Jerusalem for that purpose; nor do we find it necessary to inquire whether the book of Aristæas reports true facts, or fictions, as several learned men with great probability suppose, but we assume the current opinion that Ptolemy Philadelphus had sent Aristæas and Andreas to Jerusalem for translators, and that Eleazer the high-priest really complied with the king's desire.

^b Aristæas says, 'that the translators observed that it was common with the Jews to wash their hands in the sea, and to pray to God before they set to work' (ὡς δὲ ἔθος ἐστὶ πᾶσι τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις, ἀποκαθήμενοι τῇ θαλάσσῃ τὰς χεῖρας, ὡς δὲ ἡθάρρο πρὸς τὸν Θεόν). This is a Pharisaic precept; the Pharisees said, 'that divine names are not allowed to be written without the writer first purifying himself, and he must concentrate his thoughts, before writing the divine names, with consciousness of their importance; and if it happen that the writer of a Pentateuch for the use of the Synagogue did not direct his entire attention to the divine names, that copy could not be used. The divine names to which such

of which we are told by Aristeas and his follower Josephus, every time they were about translating the laws of Moses, if they were also not mere show and display, were at least not the necessary means for making themselves worthy to be the instruments of the Holy Ghost.

However, Mr. Grinfield says (*Apology*, p. 2), 'whenever a version is made by the same authority as the original, it surely becomes of equal force and authority.' It is true, that an Act of Parliament translated into the Irish language for the sake of the Irish subjects would become of equal force and authority with the original English, provided no alteration or modification of sense have taken place; but if there were any disagreement between the original and the copy, the translated act should have no claim of force and authority at all. This sense we deduce from the statement in the *Apology*. But there is no similarity between the translated Act of Parliament and the Greek version. The latter was not made by the same authority as the original Hebrew; the original Hebrew was made by the immediate influence of the Holy Spirit; the prophets from Moses to Malachi have announced their messages to Israel as **יְהוָה יְרֵבִירָה**, 'words of God' (2 Sam. xxiii. 2, 3; 1 Kings xxii. 16-30); but the Greek version was made by men weak, liable to mistakes and errors like ourselves. The prophets always delivered the words they were intrusted with, exactly as they received them by the Holy Spirit, neither a single word more nor less (Num. xxiii. 13); but the **לXX** were sent by a high-priest, who preferred the favour of a king to the sanctified custom of his ancestors, a custom which was considered almost as holy as the law itself; for, according to the high-priest's epistle to King Ptolemy, 'the Jews never used to allow their laws to be translated.'

If Moses and the prophets had delivered their messages to Israel in Hebrew and in Greek, and we should find both the Hebrew and the Greek of exactly corresponding meaning without any difference, we should also then be obliged to acknowledge the inspiration of this Greek version; but since this was not the case, and we believe that the Greek version was made about 286 years before Christ, a long time after prophecy had ceased in Israel, we are not under the obligation of considering the Greek version an inspired one. How, indeed, can we reasonably consider the Greek version to have been made by the influence of the Holy Spirit, since it also differs from the original in many parts, where the Hebrew is confirmed by the quotations of our Saviour and

thought must be directed are **אֱלֹהִים, אֱלֹהֵיכֶם, אֱמִיָּה אֲשֶׁר אֱמִיָּה** **אֵל אֱלֹהֵיךָ, אֱלֹהִים, אֱמִיָּה אֲשֶׁר אֱמִיָּה** (Maimonides, *Halachoth Sefer Torah*).

his

his apostles? The Greek version abounds in mistakes and errors, which cannot reasonably be ascribed to transcribers and copyists, but such as came from translators differently educated, differently gifted, and had different plans and designs which had influenced their translation. Some of those who were intrusted to perform such a great task seem to have been by no means adequate to their enterprise, understanding neither Hebrew nor Greek sufficiently: others of them seem to have been perfect masters of both the languages they had to handle; but they wilfully sacrificed the text to serve a purpose or an imagination. Thus we see in the Greek version, words falsely translated, others substituted, for which the translator had no other reason but either to preserve a Jewish conceit, to strengthen the esteem for the Jewish nation, or to avoid translations from which it might have appeared that Jewish legislation was needlessly severe. We doubt not that the Greek version we now possess, and commonly called the Septuagint, was made by a large number of differently gifted and educated men—perhaps it was, as alleged, made by seventy-two men, six from each of the Jewish tribes, for the use of King Ptolemy's library; for the difference of style, and the different translations of the same words in different parts of the Bible, makes it very probable; but we must also conclude from the same fact that the translators took but very little care to transmit to posterity an exact translation of their law. The fact is, that the Jews knew that they translated their holy law for the use of a foreign king, who was indeed of a benevolent and liberal mind, but nevertheless an idolater, and the usurper of their country; they were also free from any apprehension of being convicted of forgery or carelessness, since the original text was not well known, if at all, in Alexandria, and the cause was a common one. We must also remember the great fact, that it was not the Jews^c resident in the king's dominions who longed for a translation of the sacred books, 'but the king had determined to procure an interpretation of the law, and to have it translated from the Hebrew into Greek, and to be deposited in his library.' The king did not *command* them to bring him the law, it is true, but the complimentary embassy was imposing, and the high-priest, who had received so many favours and tokens of regard from the king, could not but submit to the wishes of his obliging master.^d

^c Whether a Greek version ever was read in the Synagogues there exists no certain proof; probably not. They were allowed to pray in the Greek language, but not to read from any other than a Hebrew Pentateuch in the Synagogue.

^d But whether the high-priest sent the *Hebrew* and not a *Chaldaic* law, we cannot tell with certainty. Philo says several times 'that the translation was made by the LXX. from the Chaldaic language' (*De Vita Moïsi*, ii. 56-7, Paris edit.); and that the translators knew of a Syriac translation of Job, we may see from

We accuse not the translators of forgery, but of deficiency and partiality. They had also prejudices like other men, and prejudices are not so easily laid aside. It is a very common observation that when prejudices have taken possession of a man's mind, they become a leading principle in all his views and actions. A striking example we see in Philo the Alexandrian Jew. His explanations of Scriptural passages are very strange; sometimes as ridiculous as a certain part of the *Agadah* in the Babylonish Talmud. But Philo himself did not perceive it; his condition as an Alexandrian philosopher and a Jew by birth impelled him to believe that he argued and reasoned just as Moses and the prophets did, and, where he was afraid of being misunderstood, he adds (*Μωσείως ἰστί δόγμα τοῦτο, οὐκ ἐμόν*), 'It is Moses who teaches so, and not we.'

Philo was quite sure that he discovered the true way of explaining Scripture.

It might have been the same principle which influenced some of the Greek translators.

If the LXX. made their translation from the original Hebrew text, it must have been the same which we now have. We are forced to acknowledge this, or else we weaken the validity of Scripture altogether; and indeed there exists no cogent and evident reason to prove that the Hebrew text has ever been corrupted. We may also appeal to the Jewish history that it was the practice of the Jewish nation to read some parts of the Pentateuch and the Prophets in the holy congregation for the edification of the people, to comfort the sinner and to strengthen the weak; and when the Jews had lost their liberty and their country, and had taken refuge in foreign lands, the synagogue still remained the sole support of their nationality. In the synagogue the Jews worshipped God. But they were allowed to worship and to pray everywhere; the synagogue aimed not only to offer a place for prayers, but the end of the synagogue was the preservation of the laws, and teaching them to the people; it has also not the name *בֵּית הַתְּפִלָּה*, 'house of prayer,' but *בֵּית הַפְּגִשָּׁה*, 'meeting-house,' *συναγωγή*. Every sabbath, and after the time of Ezra also every Monday and Thursday, several *פרשיות* *parshioth* and *הַפְּטָרוֹת* *haphtaroth* of the Pentateuch were read,

from the postscript to Job, '*οὗτος ἐμμενέσται ἐκ τῆς Συριακῆς Βίβλου*.' But the Syriac Jews probably did not make their first attempt by translating Job; they had certainly a translated Pentateuch, and also many of the Psalms for their daily prayers. The Talmud mentions still older translations than those of Job; a Targum to Esther is mentioned in *Megilah*, f. 3, and a Targum to the Psalms in *Vajikra Rabbah*, 174, c.

and

and sometimes also explained, and, according to the tradition, the reading of the Pentateuch on appointed days of the week is an arrangement made by Moses himself. The practice of it is testified by our Lord and his apostles. Josephus mentions the same practice, and says that the Jewish legislator 'did not suffer the guilt of ignorance to go on without punishment, but demonstrated the law to be the best and the most necessary instruction of all others, permitting the people to leave off their employments, and to assemble for the hearing of the law, and learning it exactly, and this not once or twice, or oftener, but every week' (Cont. Ap. ii. 17). The Jews have ever considered the words written in their סֵפֶר תּוֹרָה, 'book of the law,' to be the words of God, and they were prohibited either to add to it, or to diminish ought from it. It is also a well-known fact that they had at all times, and they retain still the same practice, official writers, especial priests, who had the care of writing new, and correcting the old books for the use of the synagogue. They are also not allowed to read from a book in which the smallest letter, e. g. 'yod,' is illegible; and is it not testified in every page of the Jewish history, that the Jews have lost their country and their liberty, and have suffered the most shameful reproaches from idolaters, and, alas! also from Christians, only for the observance of their law? How many times did enemies waste their land, only because they would not break the sabbath? And the emperor Caius Caligula had almost destroyed the whole nation, if the tribune Cherea had not slain him before he was able to carry out his purposes, only because the Jews refused to place his statue in their temple, which is forbidden in their law. After the Jews returned from the Babylonish captivity, and the temple was so far restored as to bring sacrifices there, 'Ezra rent his garment and his mantle, and plucked off the hair of his head and his beard, and sat down astonished, and assembled every one that trembled at the words of the God of Israel, because of the transgression of the exiles, and prayed to the Lord, and said, O our God, what shall we say after this? for we have forsaken thy commandments' (Ezra ix.). Also Daniel and Nehemiah repeatedly affirm that all evil which had befallen Israel was for the sake of transgressing the law. Now we ask every Christian if such a language as this quoted from Ezra ix., Dan. ix., Neh. ix. 16-35, could have been poured forth from hearts of men who are not thoroughly convinced that the laws which they had received from their fathers are the

* Οὐκ ἐλάττωσεν ἀπροσμεμένον οὐδὲ τίς ἢ πολλὰκις, ἀλλ' ἐκείνης ἐβδόμῃδος τῶν ἄλλων ἔργων ἀφεμένους, ἐπὶ τὴν ἀκρόασιν τοῦ νόμου ἐκέλευσε συλλέγεσθαι καὶ τοὺς ἀκριβοῦς ἐκμανθάνειν (comp. Deut. xvii. 18, 19; Josh. i. 8).

† Josephus, *Antiquities*, xix. 1.

laws of God? And may we suppose that the Jews themselves could have intentionally corrupted the laws which they believed to be of God? Ezra had never restored the law; he did nothing of the kind; at least such undertaking is not mentioned either in Ezra or in Nehemiah: it was also not necessary to be restored, since it was constantly kept unaltered: he restored the Jews and their land by reminding them of their afflictions and the severe punishments they had undergone for forsaking the law; and from that time neither men nor the lapse of time altered the laws of God. Christ and his apostles have also testified that the Jewish laws were the same in their time as they were given from the Mount Sinai; they constantly refer to, and remind the Jews of them. 'Is it not written in your law?' 'As it is written'—such phrases are to be found in almost every page of the New Testament. The men of the Masorah (מְסֹרֶת) have corrupted none of the words of God; they took great trouble to establish the proper reading, and, where the reading was doubtful to them, they gave the current different readings, קָרִי וְלֹא קָרִי and קָרִי וְלֹא קָרִי. It was, indeed, a singular providential care to preserve the law unaltered; the Jewish nation also is inseparable from that law; they are still the sole guardians of it. They exist still, whilst other nations have been swept away by the force of time and events. It is the Lord's saying, 'Heaven and earth shall pass, but not one jot or one tittle shall pass from the law' (Matt. v. 18).

We cannot also properly account the Hebrew language a dead one, even if it has ceased to be vernacular, and, according to Mr. Grinfield (*Apology*, p. 19), the Jews had acquired the language of their masters. Nehemiah, indeed, found that the *children* of the Jews who returned from the Babylonish captivity spake 'half in the speech of Ashdod' (Neh. xiii. 12).

The affinity of the two languages, of which we have examples in the books of Daniel and Ezra, made the children soon acquire the language of their new masters, and gradually both became incorporated into a new dialect; but Nehemiah took measures that the children might be taught ancient Hebrew. The expulsion of the strange women was not only a measure for keeping the Jews from returning to idolatrous practices, but also to return to the sanctified laws and customs, as well as to the language of Moses and the patriarchs. The adult men and women seem to have known their mother tongue, and even the hardships of the captivity did not weaken their attachment to it. We read in the account given by Nehemiah 'that the Holy Scripture was read to the

the people, and it was found written, that, etc.; and it came to pass, when they had heard the law, that they separated from Israel all the mixed multitude.' The law was read to them in the original Hebrew; and the passages quoted in Nehemiah, which had caused the people to separate the mixed multitude, are from the Pentateuch, and the people understood them, since they did accordingly, and we are not told that the people were made to understand by an interpreter. The Hebrew language, even from the time of the destruction of the second temple down to our times, was always the language of the learned Jews, who still devote their lives to the study of the (לשון הקודש) 'holy tongue.'

With them, to study Hebrew is to worship God; to study day and night is the most essential part of the Jewish service (Deut. xvii. 19, xxxi. 10-14; Josh. i. 8): that it was so in all ages of the dispersion is testified by the numberless books which have been written in Hebrew, and partly in a pure biblical Hebrew. The Mishnah, the Midrashim, the Talmud of Jerusalem and Babylon, the Pesikta Rabbatha and Pesikta Suttara, the works of the *Gonim*,^s (ספרי הגונים), and the Spanish, French, and German schools, as, *e. g.*, Maimonides, Abarbanel, Kimchi the elder and the younger, Rabbi Salomon,^a Rabbi Abraham Ben David, Manasseh Ben Israel, Moses Mendelssohn, and in our time Professor Salomon, David Luzato, and the great Rabbi Salomon Jehudah Rapport in the capital town of Bohemia, besides an immense number of other books of great celebrity.¹

It is a mistake of Mr. Grinfield to say (*Apology*, p. 57), 'that we have the Hebrew of the Old Testament buried under endless appeals to comparatively modern oriental dialects, and that the small portion of Hebrew which we really possess is stifled under a load of Arabic and Coptic, which few can read and still fewer understand.' If Mr. Grinfield were not known to be a good Hebrew scholar and a pious Christian, his adversaries could make use of the above statement to accuse him of deficiency in the knowledge of the Hebrew language, and of little esteem for the original text of the Bible. The Hebrew language is indeed very copious, and, in regard to terms of the most spiritual things, more copious than any other language. In the works which are written in the Hebrew language, the most primitive character of human

^s From 600 to 1100 years after the birth of Christ.

^a Commonly called Rashi, which are falsely thought to be the initials of Rabbi Salomon Jarchi, but it must be Jizchaki; see Zunz, *Journal*, 1815.

¹ The order of rabbinical study is:—(1) תורה (2) מִקְרָא (3) מִשְׁנָה (4) מִדְרָשׁ—

(5) מִדְרָשׁוֹת (6) הִלְכוֹת (7) תַלְמוּד (8) תוֹסֵפוֹת (9) אֲגָרוֹת—

(See *Midrash ad Song of Solomon*, f. 8. b.)

language and style is fixed, and is a type of all sanctified speech, of which we find a mighty echo in the Apocalypse. In the style of the Old Testament is not only the plainest historical narrative, crystal-like, transparent and consistent, but also the boldest of human language, and the expression of the most profound affections of the soul. The Bible was appointed for all ages; hence it bears also the stamp of universality in its language.

‘One observation,’ says Mr. Grinfield (*Apology*, p. 34), ‘deserves our attention. It will be remembered that there are several arguments of our Lord and his apostles in their citations from the Old Testament, which depend on the force and meaning of a single word. These passages prove the inspiration of the LXX., for they are each and all literally taken from that version.’ Can we not apply the same argument to every literal translation? If a literal translation proves the inspiration of the LXX., why not the inspiration of the English translators? If the inspiration claimed by the Greek version rests only upon the superiority of antiquity, and that some of the fathers esteemed that version very highly, the cause which Mr. Grinfield advocates is in danger of being lost entirely. Of no more weight is the consideration that this version had great influence upon the more modern translations, since it is possible to translate the Bible from the Hebrew text itself, without the aid of any existing version. And this ought to be the practice of every translator who fears God and trembles for His holy word. The Hebrew text alone must be our standard, and not any version, whether oriental or occidental. There is nothing obscure in the Hebrew text, which, if literally translated, could be injurious to our faith—nothing unintelligible. The very Masoretic Bible ought to be the standard of truth, and as long as there will be men in the church of God who will maintain another opinion, schisms and divisions will never cease.

Ministers of Christ’s sacraments and teachers of the word of God ought to study diligently the language of the Old Testament, and to make it their business to introduce into our schools as a fixed principle, to teach the Hebrew as well as the classical languages.

The Hebrew text has, in fact, much less obscurity than the Greek version, whose readers are led in darkness, since they are convinced that it not only egregiously blunders, but contradicts itself, and substitutes words in the most arbitrary manner; but the Hebrew is clear and intelligible, and every reader who understands the Hebrew grammar will, by a moderate diligence, soon acquire the sound mode of translating the Bible into his native language.

‘The apostle Paul,’ says Mr. Grinfield, ‘reasons on the word
πάντα’

πάντα' (Heb. ii. 8); but πάντα is only the translation of the Hebrew word כָּל in Ps. viii. 7, from which the apostle cites the passage; so also Heb. iv. 7, he reasons on the word σήμερον, which is the translation of the Hebrew word הַיּוֹם, 'to-day,' in Ps. xcv. 6; and it is much more likely that the apostle Paul, who from his youth was accustomed to hear such arguments from single words at the feet of Gamaliel, had constantly present the Hebrew text, and translated his quotations into the then vernacular Greek, which the apostle might have acquired knowledge of by a constant communication with Greek gentiles after his conversion, and especially of that of his apostleship; hence we find quotations which agree, and others which do not agree, with the language of the Greek version.

Suppose one of the apostles had come to England, he would certainly have preached or written to the inhabitants in their own native language; the following generations might have been justified, according to Mr. Grinfield's argument, to consider an English translation of the Old Testament an inspired one, even if it were full of mistakes and errors, because they knew that one of the apostles had quoted passages of the Old Testament in his epistles or sermons, which they found still existing in the Hebrew Bible, answering exactly to those which are quoted in the Bible of their native language. But that such arguments lead to false conclusions, every scholar will agree. To say or to imply that only those passages in the Hebrew text are of authority which agree with the Greek version, but those which do not agree together are of less authority, would be as much as to undervalue the Hebrew text, and to raise the LXX. above the Hebrew, which was not the intention of the Apologist.

The only demonstration concerning the version in question must be thus: all literally translated parts of the Greek version commonly called the Septuagint, which answer the Hebrew text we now possess, deserve our attention; and those parts which are either badly translated, or wilfully mistranslated, deserve no more attention than we pay to any ancient profane writer.

Who would say, for instance, that the second verse of the first chapter of the Song of Solomon is an inspired or even a good translation? Or what reader will prefer the reading of the Septuagint to that of the Hebrew text?

Song of Solomon, i. 2. כִּי טוֹבִים דָּדֶיךָ מִיָּיִן, 'Thy love is better than wine,' καὶ ἀγαθοὶ μαστοὶ σου ὑπὲρ οἴνου, 'thy breasts are better than wine.' Or verse 4, נִזְכֹּרֶה דָּדֶיךָ מִיָּיִן, 'we will remember
remember

remember thy love more than wine;’ ἀγαπήσομεν μαστοὺς σου ὑπὲρ οἶνον, ‘we will love thy breasts better than wine.’

The word חַיִּיךָ, which the English Bible renders ‘thy love,’ the LXX. translate μαστοί, ‘breasts.’ This mistake seems to have taken its rise from the deficiency of the translator’s knowledge of the Hebrew language. Let us suppose the mss. or books from which the LXX. made their translation was, as it very likely might have been, without points or vowels; the translator of the Song must, according to his translation, have read חַיִּיךָ instead of חַיִּיךָ. The characters are the same, but not the vowels, which alter the sense of the word entirely. But there are good reasons to accept the Masoretic, and to reject the Greek reading. חַיִּיךָ, as the translator must have read, means ‘teats,’ and חַיִּיךָ means ‘breasts;’ but חַיִּיךָ never means the whole ‘breasts,’ which may be seen from Ezek. xxiii. 3, 21, where the prophet makes a distinction between חַיִּיךָ and חַיִּיךָ. The LXX. translated the two passages in Ezekiel quite differently. In verse 3 they translated חַיִּיךָ בְּתוֹלִיתָן, διεπαρθευέθησαν, or ‘lost their virginity,’ and in verse 21 they translated חַיִּיךָ מִמַּצְרַיִם, ἃ ἐποίησες ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ ἐν τῷ καταλύματί σου, or ‘the things which thou wroughtest in Egypt in thy lodging.’ But they seem really not to have known the meaning of the word in question: they translated verse 17 in the same chapter, ‘And the sons of Babylon came to her into the bed of rest (חַיִּיךָ מִשְׁכָּב), instead of ‘into the bed of love,’ as it is in the English Bible. We may learn from these examples that both the translator of the Song of Solomon and of Ezekiel did not know the meaning of the word they had to translate; the former read חַיִּיךָ, and the latter must probably have read חַיִּיךָ, ‘thy lodgings:’ there are many other passages which prove that these two translators were by no means adequate to their undertaking. But the translator of the Proverbs translated חַיִּיךָ ‘love,’ as our English Bible does, and as the proper meaning of the word is. Prov. vii. 18, לֶכָה נִרְדָּה יוֹדִים, ‘Come, let us take our fill of love until the morning;’ Ἐλθέ καὶ ἀπολαύσωμεν φιλίας ἕως ὄρθρου, ‘Let us enjoy love until the morning.’ The Greek translator of the Song of Solomon was certainly a man without taste, or exact knowledge of the Hebrew.

We know that the Apologist of the Septuagint has provided (*Apology*, p. 112) an answer for such objections as we have just made

made against his cause. He says, 'that after the collation of many thousands of MSS. the general result is the same in all. There are numerous deviations occasioned by errors of transcribers, but they seldom affect the sense.' We think that even those mistakes which we have quoted already can by no means have been occasioned by transcribers, but by the translators themselves, and they affect the sense considerably; but let us investigate a few of the numerous errors we meet with in Genesis and Exodus.

Gen. ii. 6. וַיָּאֵר עָלָה מִן הָאָרֶץ, 'But there went up a *mist* from the earth;' Πηγή δὲ ἀνέβαινεν ἐκ τῆς γῆς, 'There went up a *fountain* from the earth.' Verse 7, וַיִּפַּח בְּאַפָּיו נְשָׁמַת חַיִּים, 'and breathed into his nostrils breath of life;' καὶ ἐνεφύσησεν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πνοὴν ζωῆς, 'and breathed upon his face breath of life.' These two mistakes affect also the sense, and the translation is unnatural. We know from the Mosaic account of creation that the state of the earth, before man was put upon it to till the ground, was that a vapour constantly covered the face of the earth, so that light could not penetrate, and hence the darkness; of that vapour or mist the second chapter of Genesis speaks, but not of a fountain, of which nothing is said in the first chapter. עֵץ means a fountain which comes down from a mountain or from rocks; also which is artificially made for the use of men and cattle, and never in connection with עָלָה, which signifies rising from the ground into the air (Deut. viii. 7; Exod. xv. 27); the verb עָלָה proves that the Hebrew reading is correct, and that the Greek is incorrect. The passage in verse 4 also is unnatural, for we draw breath by the means of our nostrils; hence Scripture avails itself of the words by which men signify life to signify the active principle which sets the body in motion, and says, that God has given the power to man to draw breath, which is the chief means of life, by setting the natural means into motion, through His own breathing the breath of life into man's nostrils. It is also a fine image of the invisible activity of the spirit. רֵיחַ means both 'breath' and 'spirit:' but what signifies 'breathing upon the man's face?'^k

^k These two words seemed to Philo the Alexandrian Jew so mysterious that he applied his philosophical skill to explain it; and so he understands that by the fountain is meant the great ocean, into which all other seas fall; and by the face which was breathed upon is meant the seat of perception (Philo, *De Mundi Opificio*, 29, Paris edition).

Gen. iii. 17. אֲרֻחָהּ וְאֶדְמָהּ בְּעֵבֶרְךָ, 'cursed is the ground for thy sake;' *ἡ κακάρητοι ἡ γῆ ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις σου*, 'cursed be the ground in thy labour.' This version is contradicted by the apostle Paul's arguments 'that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain, to be delivered from the bondage of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the children of God.' The curse under which the whole creation groaneth is for the sake of man's sin; man was the cause of it, and the apostle argues only from this single word בְּעֵבֶרְךָ, which the English Bible translated 'for thy sake.'

It is true that the apostle does not cite the passage of Genesis in the Epistle to the Romans, where he speaks of the curse of creation, but every reader of the Bible will perceive what passage the apostle refers to. There is indeed no other passage by which it can be proved that the creation is cursed for man's sake, except this in Gen. iii. 17. But by the translation of the Septuagint this revealed information of the apostle is quite destroyed, and the apostle could not have argued so, as he does in the Epistle to the Romans, if he had only the Greek version, and not the Hebrew text, before him. We have now seen a striking proof that the apostle Paul refers to the *Hebrew letter*; the Hebrew text was constantly present to his mind; he studied the Hebrew Bible from his youth, used it as a member of the synagogue, and explained it to us as an apostle by the inspiration of the Lord's spirit. *The Christian doctrine (and this is what we wish to impress upon the reader's mind) depends entirely upon the Hebrew letter, and upon no translation, however excellent.* Another example will support this opinion. That Christ must be slain to redeem mankind by making his body an atonement for our sins, the disciples knew from Isa. liii., which was explained to them by Christ himself, to which also the apostles and evangelists constantly refer in the gospels and epistles. The most striking passage in that important chapter is the 10th verse; and this verse is, in the Greek version of the LXX. so translated, that nothing remained by which the sacrifice of Christ could be proved to have been predicted by the prophet Isaiah. The passage in question is:

יְהוָה חָפֵץ רָכָאוֹ הִתְלַיִן · אִם תִּשִּׁים אֶשְׁם בְּפֶשֶׁךָ · יִרְאֶה זֶרַע · יֵאָרֵךְ יְצִלָּה חֲפֵץ יְהוָה בִּידוֹ יִצְלָה · יָמִים · חֲפֵץ יְהוָה בִּידוֹ יִצְלָה, 'Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him; he hath put him to grief; when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed; he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand;'

Kai Κύριος βούλεται καθαρίσαι αὐτὸν τῆς πληγῆς· ἐὰν δ᾽ αὖτε περὶ ἁμαρτίας, ἡ ψυχὴ ὑμῶν ὀψεται σπέρμα μακρόβιον, 'The Lord also is

is pleased to purge him from his stroke. If ye can give an offering for sin, your soul shall see a long-lived seed.' We shall make an attempt to translate the Greek version of the 10th verse of the chapter in question into Hebrew, and prove the grammatical impossibility of the reading ever having been such as it must have been according to the Greek version:

וְיִדְוֶה חֲפֵץ מְדַרְוֹ מְחֻלִּי . אִם תִּשְׁמִי אִשָּׁם בְּעַד חַטָּאִים . נִפְשְׁכֶם
תִּרְאֶה וְרַע יֶאֱרִיד יָמִים .

Now, we never find in the Bible מְדַרְוֹ, 'to cleanse,' or 'to purge,' in connection with חֻלִּי, 'illness, weakness'; this verb is applied to חַטָּא, 'sin' (Num. xix. 19; Ezek. xxxvi. 25); מְדַרְוֹ is always in opposition to טָמֵא, 'unclean,' but never used to signify 'to heal,' which is the Hebrew word רָפָא (Ps. ciii. 3; Exod. xv. 27). There is also no instance where two words are used as one epithet to a preceding noun, as we must consider יֶאֱרִיד יָמִים to be epithet to וְרַע, and if so, it means 'natural children;' but in this sense the word רָאָה, 'to see,' cannot be applied to it; it is generally connected either with נָתַן, 'to give,' or וָרַע, 'to produce seed.' This example shows clearly that the Masoretic Hebrew text is the correct one, and that the apostles must have connected their words just as we have them connected by the means of the accents. In the passage which we have quoted from Gen. iii. 17, the translator perhaps mistook דָּ for רָ, and he read בְּעִבְדְּךָ, 'in thy labour,' instead of בְּעִבְדְּךָ, 'for thy sake;' but in the passage of Isaiah we can find no other reason to account for the Greek translation, except neglect of the Hebrew text or partiality.

Gen. vi. 3. לֹא יֵדִין רִחוּי בָאָדָם לְעוֹלָם, 'My spirit shall not always strive with man;' Οὐ μὲν καταμείνην τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τούτοις εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, 'My spirit shall not remain amongst men for ever.' דָּן never means 'to remain;' it means either 'to judge, to strive, or to exercise a ruling power over another;' it seems to us that it is used here, in the passage in question, in the third sense, and ought to be translated 'my spirit shall not always exercise its power in man, for he is flesh.' God says that the weakness of the flesh is not adequate to the power of His spirit (Ps. lxxv. 39), and it cannot raise itself to be equal in force and in lasting results, but it relaxes, and is weakened by the progressive

gressive power of the spirit:¹ hence God's oracle says, my spirit will not exercise its power in the flesh eternally, because it is God's pleasure to shorten man's life by appointing a period of 120 years as its extreme length. The sense 'of not to remain amongst men' means that man must die, but death was announced to Adam for his transgression, so that the repetition of the same decree was quite unnecessary; and the connection of verse 6 with the preceding verse proves clearly that especial notice is here taken of that struggle between the laws of the flesh and the laws of the spirit, of which the apostle speaks in his Epistle to the Romans.

Gen. vi. 13. כֵּן כָּל בָּשָׂר בָּא לִפְנֵי, 'The end of all flesh is come before me;' Καὶ ὅτε πάντες ἀνθρώπου ἦκει ἐναντίον μου. We know from the Mosaic narrative of the deluge that not only men, but also animals perished; hence God said, 'the end of all flesh,' and not end of all men (as in the Greek) is come before me.

Gen. iv. 15. וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֵל קֵן לֵכֵן, 'And the Lord said unto Cain, therefore;' Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Κύριος ὁ Θεός, οὕχ αἶτω, 'not so,' as if the Hebrew word were לֵא. Another very striking example of carelessness or wilful disregard of the original Hebrew is this: there occurs six times in the Hebrew text of Genesis the name of 'Almighty God,' אֱלֹהֵי שַׁדַּי *El-Shaddai* (ch. xvii. 1; xxviii. 3; xxxv. 2; xliii. 13; xlviii. 3; xlix. 25). The Greek translator renders it either by Κύριος or Θεός: the name 'Almighty God' seems to have been quite unknown to the translator of Genesis; the translator of Exodus translates אֱלֹהֵי שַׁדַּי, Θεός ὡν αὐτῶν, which gives also not the complete sense of 'omnipotence,' as the translator of Job renders it by παντοκράτωρ. The revelation unto Moses (Exod. vi. 3), that God was known to the patriarchs only by the name of Almighty God, and not by the name of Jehovah or Κύριος, which name God revealed unto Moses (and which revelation refers decidedly to those passages which we have quoted from the book of Genesis), is entirely destroyed by the translation of the LXX.: thus by the Greek translation we are deprived of one of the most ancient revelations of God's names and attributes, and especially of that by which the patriarchs addressed their God in their worship and prayers.

¹ Hieronymus says, 'In Ebraeo scriptum est: Non judicabit spiritus meus homines in sempiternum, quoniam caro sunt. Hoc est, quia fragilis est in homine conditio, non est ad aeternos servabo cruciatus, sed hic illis restituam quod merentur.'

Yet the Apologist for the Septuagint advocates the inspiration of its translators.

In every passage where the Greek version differs from the Hebrew text, there are either grammatical difficulties and mistakes, or contradictions to historical facts, irreconcilable to apostolic authority.

The numerous errors we meet with in every page of the book of Genesis make the Greek version of the LXX. far inferior to any of the current Protestant translations—inferior to Luther's—inferior to the English translation of the Bible.

Great mistakes prevail with regard to proper names: some proper nouns are translated as appellatives, and some appellatives as if they were proper nouns.

Gen. xiv. 5. וְאֶת הַזֻּזִּים בְּרָם, 'the Zuzims in Ham;' καὶ ἔθνη ἰσχυρὰ ἅμα αὐτοῖς; the translator seemed to have mistaken the letters, as it was often the case with him, and read, וְנִים הַזֻּזִּים בְּרָם.

Gen. xv. 2. וְאָמַר אַבְרָם אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה מַה תֵּתֵן לִי וְאָנֹכִי הֵלֶךְ. וַיֹּאמֶר אַבְרָם, 'And Abraham said, Lord God, what wilt thou give me, seeing that I go childless, and the steward of my house is this Eliezer of Damascus;' λέγει δὲ Ἀβραμ, Δέσποτα Κύριε, τί μοι δώσεις; ἐγὼ δὲ ἀπολύομαι ἄτεκνος. Ὁ δὲ υἱὸς Μασέκ τῆς οἰκογενοῦς μου, οὗτος Δαμασκός Ἐλιέζερ. The Greek translator rendered *Meshek*, which the English Bible translates 'steward,' as if a proper noun of a female slave. It seems that the translator did not exactly know the root of מֶשֶׁק, and to get out of the perplexity he substituted the word בֵּת, and read thus: וְכֵן בֵּת-בֵּיתִי מֶשֶׁק. הוּא רֹמֶשֶׁק אֱלִיעֶזֶר. But we think there is no passage in the Bible by which it can be proved that בֵּת הַבֵּית means a female slave: we find בֵּת הַבֵּית or יֶלֶד בֵּית for a man-servant, but שִׁפְחָה or אָמָה is always applied for a maid-servant.

Gen. xxii. 13. וַיֵּרָא יְהוָה אֵלַי אַחֵר נֶאֱחָז בַּסֶּבֶךְ בְּקֶרְנָיו, 'And, behold, a ram caught in a thicket by his horns;' Καὶ ὁ σὺ κριὸς εἰς κατεχόμενος ἐν φυτῷ Σαβῆκ. This translation exhibits two mistakes. אַחֵר is translated as if it was אֶחָד, 'one,' and סֶבֶךְ, 'a thicket,' is left untranslated, as if it were a proper noun.

Gen. xli. 2, 19. וַתִּרְעֶינָה בָּאָחוּ, 'And they fed in a meadow;'

Καὶ ἐβόσποντο ἐν τῷ Ἀχί: but in Job ἄν is translated πάπυρος.

Gen. xlviii. 7. בָּעֵד כְּבֶרֶת אֶרֶץ לְבוֹא אֶפְרָתָה, 'When there was but a little way to come unto Ephrath;,' Κατὰ τὸν ἱππόδρομον Χαβραθὰ τῆς γῆς, τοῦ ἐλθεῖν Ἐφραθὰ, 'As I drew nigh to the horsecourse of Chabratha so as to come to Ephratha.'

There remains a large number of errors which we pass over only for lack of room in the space allotted to us: there is, in fact, no single page in the book of Genesis without four or five—sometimes more than ten—mistakes, which considerably affect the sense; whole verses are missing, words repeated and supplied, for which we can find no probable reason, except that of deficiency or wilful neglect of the Hebrew text. It is indeed very astonishing that this book, the first book of the sacred volume, which contains the most important documents of God's covenant with the patriarchs and with men in general, should have been so little regarded by the translator, and that he should have handled the text so carelessly.

The book of Exodus is much better translated: we mean those chapters of Exodus which we possess are translated with more care and exactness than the book of Genesis. But there are many verses missing, and especially faulty is the narrative of the construction of the tabernacle. Yet most of the missing verses might have been lost in the lapse of time.

The translator of the second book of Moses seemed to have been perfectly acquainted with both the Greek and the Hebrew language. The mistakes which we meet with therein are of quite another nature than those we have pointed out in Genesis. We shall pass over those mistakes which may be supposed to have been occasioned by the ignorance of transcribers, but we shall point out some which cannot reasonably be ascribed to that source. It is obvious that the translator of Exodus had a plan, which he strictly followed; and for the maintenance of his design he sacrificed the original text: sometimes it was for a philosophical, sometimes for a political reason, at another time for the sake of saving the reputation for humanity of the Jewish legislator, that the translator disregarded the text from which he had to translate; often he altogether avoided to translate words, from which it might have appeared that the ordinances of the Jewish legislator were unnecessarily severe.

The translator of Exodus worked methodically; he knew what he was doing: but the translator of Genesis seemed to have had neither any design nor the requisite knowledge for his task; nor
was

was it any object of his solicitude to transmit to posterity an exact translation of the important book entrusted to him. A few instances from the book of Exodus will support our opinion.

Exod. xiii. 13. וְכֹל פֶּטֶר הַמֹּרֶת הַפֶּדָה בֶּשֶׂה יֵאָמֵר לֹא תִפְדֶּה וְעִרְפֹתוֹ
 'And every firstling of an ass thou shalt redeem with a lamb; and if thou wilt not redeem it, then thou shalt break his neck.' Πᾶν διανοῖγον μήτραν ὄνου, ἀλλάξεις προβάτω· ἰὰν δὲ μὴ ἀλλάξης, λυτρώσῃ αὐτό, 'Every offspring opening the womb of the ass, thou shalt *change* for a sheep, and if thou wilt not *change* it, thou shalt *redeem* it.' This translation is contradicted by the law itself: the exchange of an unclean beast is prohibited (Levit. xxvii. 11); in the case of an unclean animal being a firstling, the owner was ordered 'to redeem it at the estimation of the priest, and to add a fifth part thereto.' There is a distinct difference between redemption and exchange. Redemption was made for money, but exchange means to give one animal for another, which is prohibited in the law itself, and, according to the nature of the law, also impossible; for in the case of a clean animal being a first-born one, it belongs to God naturally (according to the law given still when the Jews were in Egypt), and there can be no exchange unless both the exchanged animal and that by which it is exchanged are holy to the Lord; but in the case of an unclean animal being a firstling, no exchange can take place, because the clean animal would be made holy by exchanging an animal which naturally belongs to the Lord.

The translator partly misunderstood the law, and partly he avoided the translation of the word וְעִרְפֹתוֹ, which the English Bible renders 'thou shalt break his neck' only for the sake of avoiding the necessity of making the Jewish legislator appear unnecessarily cruel. In Exod. xxxiv. 20 the translation is a little altered, but the main ordinance is left out. That the breaking of the neck of a first-born unclean beast is connected with the whole law of the Mosaic institution of sacrifices, and that in another case the Jews were ordered to break the neck of a clean animal, to entreat God not to lay innocent blood unto Israel's charge (Deut. xxi. 1-10), the translator seems to have taken no notice of; it was the translator's design to show the wisdom of the Jewish legislator; but since he could discover no wisdom in breaking an animal's neck, and was also afraid that the humane king Ptolemy might consider such a law a cruel one, the translator avoided translating it by substituting another sense.

Another example of the same description we find in Exod.

xxii. 18, **לֹא תִחַדּוּ לַכַּשִּׁפָּה**, 'Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live;' **Φαρμακοὺς οὐ περιποιήσετε.**^m Every reader of the Old Testament knows that the Bible considers a charmer, a witch, a consulter with familiar spirits, or a wizard, as false prophets, who misled the people of God to worship natural or Satanic powers, and are busily engaged in doing mischief; hence the people were ordered not to suffer them to live, for they were an abomination in the sight of the Lord. The first inhabitants of Canaan practised such doings, and they drew upon themselves God's displeasure; but the people of God were prohibited imitating idolaters; for God himself ordained a prophet, who shall speak in His name, whose voice every Israelite ought to obey. By the Greek version this important truth, which runs through the whole history of God's ancient people, is entirely destroyed. We may also learn from the history of King Saul, that he obeyed the law, and 'cut off those that had familiar spirits, and the wizards out of the land,' but the witch at En-dor seemed to have escaped the common lot of her sisters and brethren, perhaps by the protection of the king's servants themselves, since they recommended her to the king when his madness made him inquire for a consulter with a familiar spirit (1 Sam. xxviii. 6).

The translator of Exodus sometimes disregarded the Hebrew text from regard to a philosophical opinion. It appears to us that the translator often avoids translating expressions, from which it might have appeared that the laws either contradict themselves or teach anthropomorphism. We must remember that after the Jews returned from the Babylonish captivity, it was the special care of their leading men to use every means possible to prevent the nation from falling back into idolatrous practices, to which they justly ascribed their captivity in Babylon: they learned by their afflictions that the God of Israel is not to be trifled with, and that His hand is not too short to fulfil all his pleasure: the leading men, therefore, devised a precaution, which they called **סִיג לַתּוֹרָה**, 'a fence about the law.'ⁿ 'It was not an addition to the law, they said, but a guard not to violate the majesty of the law itself;' besides this, the Jews brought with them from the captivity new ideas and a kind of philosophy; this new heaven produced schisms amongst the people. So we really

^m The Alexandrian MSS. have *οὐ περιβιόσσετε*.

ⁿ The law, for instance, prohibits the Israelites making any covenant with idolaters; but for fear they might violate this law, the Rabbis have prohibited also to drink wine with idolaters (see Fagius, to the *Pirke Aboth*, *Mishnah*, 1).

find

find shortly after that period, besides the Samaritans, also חֲסִידִים *Chasidim*, צַדִּיקִים *Zadikim*, and קְרָאִים *Karaim*; these branched out in several divisions of (פְּרִישִׁים), Pharisees, (אֲסִיָּאִים), Essenes, and (זֵלֹטִים) Zelotes, which divided the hearts of the people, and prepared for the final catastrophe of the destruction of the holy city and temple. The men who came from Jerusalem to Alexandria to translate the Bible for King Ptolemy's library were no doubt men of high station and rank amongst their nation, men of learning and wisdom, as Aristeeas^o tells us; but they probably were not so free from the current opinions of the day as not to have been influenced by them in their task of translating the Hebrew Bible into Greek. We shall quote examples from which we have been led to entertain this opinion.

Exod. xxiv. 10, 11. יָדְאוּ אֶת אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְתַחַת רַגְלָיו כַּמַּעֲשֵׂה לִבְנֵת הַסִּפִּיר . וְכַעֲצֵם הַשָּׁמַיִם לְשֹׁחֵר . וְאֵל אֲצִילִי בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לֹא שָׁלַח יְדוֹ וַיַּחֲזוּ אֶת הָאֱלֹהִים וַיֹּאכְלוּ וַיִּשְׁתּוּ , 'And they saw the God of Israel, and there was under his feet as it were a paved work of a sapphire stone, and as it were the body of heaven in his clearness. And upon the nobles of the children of Israel he laid not his hand, also they saw God, and they did eat and drink;' Καὶ εἶδον τὸν τόπον οὗ εἰστήκει ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ· καὶ τὰ ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ, ὥσει ἔργον πλίνθου σαπφείρου, καὶ ὥσπερ εἶδος στερεώματος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τῇ καθαριότητι. Καὶ τῶν ἐπιλέκτων τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ, οὐ διεφώνησεν οὐδὲ εἶς. Καὶ ὤφθησαν ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἔφαγον καὶ ἔπιον.

The reason of the translation 'and they saw the place where the God of Israel stood,' instead of 'they saw the God of Israel;' and in verse 11, 'and of the chosen ones of Israel there *was not one missing*, and they appeared in *the place of God*,' instead of translating it as our English Bible, can be no other than to avoid the appearance of anthropomorphism: the translator was a Jewish philosopher, perhaps born in Alexandria, who might have gone to Jerusalem to acquire there knowledge of Hebrew, and it was a hard task for him to translate 'they saw God, and under his feet, &c., and he laid not his hand upon them.' He disregarded the text barely for the sake of avoiding the representation of *Israel's God* with a body like that of a man. The Targumists have the

^o Ἐπιλέξας γὰρ τοὺς ἀρίστους ἄνδρας, καὶ παιδείᾳ διαφέροντας, ἅτε δὴ γονέων τετευχότας ἐνδόξων, οἵτινες οὐ μόνον τῶν Ἰουδαϊκῶν γραμμάτων ἔξιν περιεποίησαν αὐτοῖς· ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν ἐφρόντισαν οὐ παρέργως κατασκευῆς. κ. τ. λ.

same practice, and Jonathan Ben Uzziel translates the passage in question: **וַיֵּדְּוּ אֶת אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל**, 'And they saw the glory of the God of Israel;' *Tópos*, or *ἡκός*,^p or place, was a favourite word of the Alexandrian school to signify God who is in every place, and fills the universe, and is space in Himself, but not contained by the space (see Philo *De Somnis*, 574-575, Paris edition).

Exod. xv. 3. **יְהוָה אִישׁ מִלְחָמָה**, 'the Lord is a *man* of war;' *Kýrios συντρίβων πολέμους*, 'the Lord brings wars to nought.'

Exod. xv. 10. **נִשְׁפָּתָה בְּרוּחְךָ**, 'thou didst *blow* with thy wind;' *Ἀπέστειλας τὸ πνεῦμά σου*, 'thou sentest forth thy wind.'

The translator seems to have considered also these two terms too 'anthropomorphic;' hence he substituted other words which are also applied to signify God's attributes in other passages of the Bible, *e. g.*:—Exod. xv. 17. 'Thou sentest thy wind,' and Ps. xxi. 5, 'thou breakest (**שֹׁבֵר**), or bringest to nought the cedars of Lebanon.'

From other passages we can prove that the translator disregarded the text barely for political reasons. We apprehend that the translator substituted or left untranslated words where the sense would have made the Jewish nation appear contemptible in the sight of God, and unworthy of being restored to their former glory.

In Exod. xxxii. the 9th verse is left quite untranslated. 'I have seen,' God said, 'this people, and behold it is a stiff-necked people.'

It was not the translator's design *to save souls* by the means of the translated word of God; his design was to raise the political state of his nation by displaying the excellency of their laws, concerning which King Ptolemy strongly desired to have information. What an effect would have been produced by such an oracle as the above upon the king's mind? He was induced to set the Jewish captives at liberty, and paid for the Jewish slaves from his own treasury; he sent ambassadors to Eleazer the high-priest with magnificent presents for the holy temple and priests; he intreated them to send him their law, and the same law witnesses against the Jews themselves! How could the translator pass over the verse in question, unless it suggested to

^p Very strange is the translation of 1 Sam. xxi. 2.

him the danger of losing the king's favour instead of securing it more lastingly for his people? The opportunity of ameliorating the miserable condition of the exiles by means of this translation was a rare and favourable one; and the translator, who was, as we have seen, a prudent man, seized it, that he might get the reputation of a good citizen, and a deliverer of Israel amongst the citizens of Jerusalem, and so clear himself from reproaches he might expect to incur, had he neglected so splendid an occasion of doing them good.

We know that the term 'stiff-necked' occurs in Exodus twice more, which the translator did not omit to translate. But there is a great difference in the mode in which verse 9 of chap. xxxii. and verses 5 and 3 of chap. xxxiii. were pronounced by God.

Verse 9 of chap. xxxii. is God's everlasting oracle 'that the Jewish nation displeased God, and that he was about to destroy them entirely for their obstinacy;' but at the prayer of Moses God was pleased to spare them; and having remembered the covenant with the patriarchs, the Lord commanded Moses to go down to the people and tell them (ver. 3, 5) to put off their ornaments, and reminds them of their former obstinacy. The reader of the original Hebrew text will perceive the great stress which is laid upon the 9th verse, chap. xxxii. Yet the second and third repetition rather proves God's great favour to Israel than His displeasure, since He was pleased to hear and answer the prayers of their legislator, and to pardon their gross apostacy.

Another instance of the same description is Exod. xxxii. 22. Moses reproaches Aaron for the levity which he had manifested by indulging the multitude in their wicked desire of making them gods; but Aaron answered, **אַתָּה יָדַעְתָּ אֵת הָעָם כִּי בָרַע הוּא**,

'Thou knowest that the people lay in wickedness;' **Σὺ γὰρ οἶδας τὸ ἔγκλημα τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου**, 'Thou knowest the impetuosity of the people.' No, it was not impetuosity that made Israel ask for gods made by man's hands—no, it was wickedness; they changed the uncorruptible Creator unto a calf made of perishable metal by a perishable man. That Aaron means really to say that the people are wicked (comp. 1 John v. 19), we may learn from the following words, and they said unto me 'make us gods.'

One more example from Exodus to show that there are also instances, from which we may deduce that the translator was not entirely acquainted with the spirit of the Jewish legislation.

Exod. xxi. 22. 'If men strive, and hurt a woman with child, so that her fruit depart from her, and yet no mischief follow, he shall be surely punished according as the woman's husband will lay

lay upon him, and he shall pay as the judges determine; and if any mischief follow, then thou shalt give life for life.' This is indeed an exactly literal translation; but the Greek translation gives no sense at all: 'Εὰν δὲ μάχωνται δύο ἄνδρες, καὶ πατάξωσι γυναῖκα ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσαν, καὶ ἐξέλθῃ τὸ παιδίον, μὴ ἐξεικονισμένον, ἐπιζήμιον ζημιωθήσεται. Καθότι ἂν ἐπιβάλῃ ὁ ἀνὴρ τῆς γυναίκος, δώσει μετὰ ἀξιώματος. Ἐὰν δὲ ἐξεικονισμένον ᾖ, δώσει ψυχὴν ἀντὶ ψυχῆς; 'If two men strive and smite a woman with child, and her child be born *imperfectly formed*, he shall be forced to pay a penalty, as the woman's husband may lay upon him; he shall pay with a valuation. But if it be perfectly formed, he shall give life for life.'

This Mosaic law, as we have it in the Hebrew Bible, means to say, that when a man strikes a pregnant woman accidentally, so that it causes an untimely birth, yet the woman's life is not endangered by it, the man by whom the accident was occasioned is to be punished; he is obliged to pay the penalty the judges and the husband lay upon him, but he is not liable to the penalty of death; but in case the woman herself dies, the man who occasioned the mischief must die, according to the law—נֶפֶשׁ תַּחַת נֶפֶשׁ, 'soul for soul.' But according to the Greek translation, the law is this: 'If a man strike a woman in the state of pregnancy, and the child be born imperfectly formed, the man must pay a penalty; but if the child be born perfectly formed (a healthy, perfect child), the man must give soul for soul (he must die).'

Exod. xix. 4. אַתֶּם רִאִיתֶם אֲשֶׁר אָשָׂא אֶתְכֶם עַל כַּנְפֵי נְשָׁרִים, 'You have seen how I bare you on eagles' wings;,' Αὐτοὶ ἐώρακατε ὅσα ἀνέλαβον ὑμᾶς ὡς ἐπὶ πτερύγων αετῶν, 'You have seen how I bare you LIKE on eagles' wings.' So also Onkelos, וְאַתְּ לִילִית, נֶפֶשׁ נֶפֶשׁ יִתְבָּן כְּדָעַל גִּפִּי נְשָׁרִין.

Exod. xxi. 6. וְהִנֵּשׂוּ אֲדוֹנָיו אֶל הָאֱלֹהִים, Προσάξει αὐτὸν ὁ Κύριος αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὸ κριτήριον τοῦ Θεοῦ. There are also many verses which are only commentary, or for the sake of exalting the Israelites, e. g., chap. xxiii. 18, ὅταν γὰρ ἐκβάλῃ τὰ ἔθνη ἀπὸ προσώπου σου, καὶ ἐμplantύνῃ τὰ ὄρεά σου; also the last part of verse 22 in the same chapter, which is not in any version, neither in the Syriac, nor Arabic, nor Samaritan.

Sometimes the translator troubled not himself to read a whole period in connection, but translated as it seemed proper at the first sight, e. g. chap. xxi. 7, וְכִי יִמְכֹּר אִישׁ אֶת בְּתוּלָתוֹ לְאִמָּה · לֹא,

(ch. xl. 26) : רָאוּ מִי בָרָא אֱלֹהִים, 'Behold, who has created these things,' by ἴδετε, τίς καταδείξει ταῦτα πάντα, 'Behold, who has manifested them.'* It is true that the Hebrew word בָּרָא, 'to create,' is also used where the Scriptures narrate that things have been created from matter (Gen. i. 21, 27); but we may suppose that the Scripture has cautiously used the term בָּרָא to signify the creation by the word of God, and not from matter, which, if so, must have been eternal, like God himself. The terms עָשָׂה and יָצַר, which are also employed in the narrative of creation, are only used to express the creation of different shapes and forms, but never of the primitive creation. The Hebrew בָּרָא may also be translated by ποίεω, but not by καταδείξω. It is not our task to enter into the question, 'whether matter was from eternity,' but we believe that the eternity of matter is irreconcilable to the eternity of One God. The existence of two independent eternal beings is contradicted by reason and by faith; however, the notion existed, and does still exist, amongst the Jewish philosophers, who established the opinion, *ex nihilo nihil*. This is the established principle of the Cabala, which teaches 'the emanation of all things from God.' The doctrine of emanation took its rise from denial of the creation of the world out of nothing. But should the objection be made, that we advocate too high an antiquity for the Cabala, we should answer that we have many passages in the Mishnah† which bear the stamp of being cabalistic notions; and the method of avoiding literal translations, from which anthropomorphism could appear, proves that there already existed in the time of the LXX. the doctrine which taught the propriety of hiding under conventional words certain mysteries or secrets with which only a few had been intrusted. In the Bible itself there is indeed nothing said of any secret doctrines; it was a revelation, not a concealment, and cannot, therefore, contain hidden mysteries under its plainest disclosures; but it seems that the first chapter of Ezekiel had early presented itself to learned Jews as a basis on which to rear sundry quaint fancies of their own. Thus, the description of the chariot in the first chapter of Ezekiel is called מַעֲשֵׂה כְרוּבִים, and the first chapter of the Pentateuch מַעֲשֵׂה בְרָאשִׁית.

* The well-known book Zohar gives the following explanation to the above words: 'Before the creation God's name was כִּי, 'who?' but when he had created these things (אֱלֹהִים), these two words were united, and it became אֱלֹהִים.

† So Isa. xli. 20; xliii. 15.

‡ Uktism, iii. 12; Sabbath, 59; Taanith, 23; Kethuboth, 106.

These two obscure chapters have always been considered as the most mystical parts of the Bible, and hence the Mishnah says, 'The history of creation' must not be explained to two, and the history of the chariot not even to one, unless he is wise and quick of comprehension of himself; in this case he may be initiated in these mysteries, but only by hints and intimations.* Engagement in this study was considered highly dangerous to positive faith.

The Alexandrian translators were philosophers, and they also have looked for support of their opinions in the Holy Scripture. The method of paraphrasing the anthropomorphic passages of Scripture, and of paraphrasing the name of יהוה (Jehovah) by τόπος = locus or place, is quite agreeable to the Alexandrian philosophy. So says Philo the Alexandrian Jew, 'Space and the things which fill it up were created in one time:' we can, therefore, not say that the creator is contained in space; 'the creator himself is the space of the universe, for he is all, and contains all things.' The same idea we find expressed in the *Midrash Rabba Parashah*, 68, **הקדוש ברוך הוא מקומו של עולם ואין**, **עולמו מקומו**, 'The Holy One, blessed be he, is the space of the world, but the world is not his space.' We have only to read carefully the 33rd chapter of Exodus to see that the translator was philosophizing: he translates the words, **הודיעני נא את דרכיך**, 'let me know thy way,' by ἐμφανίσόν μοι σεαυτόν, 'show

* The question whether matter is from eternity had also engaged the celebrated schools of Shammai and Hillel. In Talmud, *Tract Berachoth*, § 81, we read the following question discussed: 'The School of Shammai has decided that the thanksgiving-prayer for the creation of light must be thus: **צרוך אתה יהוה הברא** צרוך אתה יהוה הברא, 'Blessed be God who created the light of fire.' But the school of Hillel has decided for the following prayer-form: **צרוך אתה יהוה בורא מאור**, **האש** צרוך אתה יהוה בורא מאור, 'Blessed be God who creates the light of fire.' The school of Shammai held consequently an absolute creation, according to the Mosaic narrative, that in six days the universe was finished; they decided, therefore, for **ברא**, which is the præterite: but the school of Hillel held matter to be eternal; they decided, therefore, for **בורא** in the part. pres.; because, if God is constantly creating, he must never have begun to create, consequently matter must have existed from eternity. The last opinion they supported by verses from the Psalms (cxxxvi. 4, 5, 7) the verb **עושה** is used there, in part. present. The Jews in their daily prayers say also: **המחדש במבול בכל יום תמיד מעשה בראשית: כאמור: לעושה אורים נדולים**, 'Who renews through his kindness, constantly and daily, the works of creation, as it is said; who makes great lights.'

אין דורשין לא במעשה בראשית בשנים ולא במדברכה ביהיד אלא אם כן
הקם ומבין מדעתו מוסרים לו ראשי פרקים:

me thyself.' So in verse 15, הֲרֵאֵינִי נֹא אֶת כְּבוֹדִי, 'show me thy glory,' by ἐμφάνισόν μοι σαυτόν, 'show me thyself;' verse 19, אֲנִי אַעֲבִיר כָּל טוֹבִי עַל פָּנֶיךָ, 'I will make all my goodness pass before thee,' by Ἐγὼ παρελεύσομαι πρότερός σου τῇ δόξῃ μου, 'I shall pass before thee with my glory.' We consider this mode of explaining Scripture to be very absurd, for it does by no means remove any difficulty, nor does it cause the meaning to be better understood, because, whilst the translator labours to explain a difficult passage relating to the most high God, he involves himself in more difficulties by accumulating words which impede a clear comprehension; on the other hand, no language is sufficient to express abstract ideas, and all endeavours to describe the divine nature to man with exactness must prove to be utterly in vain. If, instead of 'I have seen God,' we say, 'I have seen the place where God stood,' we are not a whit the wiser for it, because the idea that *God stood on a place*, conveys with it the idea that God has feet, so that we are brought round again to the very idea which this device seeks to abolish. The Holy Scripture uses the plainest language possible, more especially where we are told of God's attributes and of his dealings with men (Exod. xxxiv. 6, 7). The Bible was intended for the use of every man—for great and small, learned and unlearned, therefore it is written in a plain language. There is no abstruse philosophy in the Bible; but when the Jews degenerated, they looked for philosophy; and to reconcile the Greeks with their law, they endeavoured to show them that the philosophy of the Jewish law-giver was of a higher excellency than that of the Greek legislators and philosophers.* This mode of paraphrasing such anthropomorphical passages was observed by all translators of the Pentateuch, except by him who translated the book of Genesis. This we consider as a proof that the translator of Genesis made use of previous translations of this book, which may also account for the many errors it contains. We have carefully examined every word of Genesis, and we find only two or three passages which can *perhaps* be considered as intentional deviations from the original in order to avoid the appearance of anthropomorphism, but which may more probably have proceeded from the want of a thorough acquaintance with the Hebrew tongue than from design. The texts are—Gen. iv. 1, קָנִיתִי אִישׁ, 'I have gotten a man from the Lord;' Ἐκτησάμην

* Of those who seek subtilities in the Scripture we may say, 'Lo! God hath made man upright, but they have sought out many inventions' (Eccles. vii. 29).

ἄνθρωπον

ἄνθρωπον διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ, 'I have gotten a man by God.' The Hebrew word אֵת is either a sign of the objective case, or it is a preposition (*cum*, with). Granting that the passage in question was not Eve's exclamation of happiness, 'that she has born *the Lord*,' but that she said 'I have gotten a man with the Lord,' or, as the Syriac translates it, ܡܢ ܕܝܗܘܐ, 'I have gotten a man to the Lord;' yet אֵת has never the meaning 'by,' as διὰ with the genitive case generally expresses. The Targum of Onkelos translates it קָנִיתִי נִבְרָא מִן קֳדָם יְהוָה, 'I have bought a man in the sight of the Lord.'

The other instances are in Gen. vi. 6, וַיַּעֲצֵב אֵל לִבּוֹ, 'and it grieved him in his heart;' καὶ διανοήθη, 'and he reflected:' ver. 9, נֹחַ אֶת הָאֱלֹהִים הִתְהַלֵּךְ, 'and Noah walked with God;' τῷ Θεῷ εὐμεθέστερσε Νῶε, 'Noah was pleasing to God.' These three are the only examples we have found in the whole book of Genesis, which may perhaps be reckoned amongst those passages purposely so translated as to avoid the apparent anthropomorphism. Onkelos seems to have observed the following method in his translation of anthropomorphic passages: when the action told of God might have been told also of men, he substituted the word מִימְרָא, *e. g.*, Exod. xv. 10, 'Thou didst blow with thy wind;' אִמְרָתִי בְּמִימְרִי, 'Thou hast spoken with thy word.' Exod. xx. 24, 'In all places where I record my name, I will come unto thee, and will bless thee;' Onkelos, אֲשִׁלָּח בְּרַכְתִּי, 'I will send my blessing, and shall bless thee.'

The other Targums (Jonathan and Jerusalem) are still more anxious to avoid anthropomorphism than even Onkelos himself, *e. g.*, וְאֵל יִדְבַר עִמָּנוּ אֱלֹהִים; Exod. xx. 19, 'Let not God speak with us.' Onkelos, וְלֹא יִמְלֵל עִמָּנָא יְהוָה, but Jonathan, וְלֹא יִתְמַלֵּל עִמָּנָא מִן קֳדָם יְהוָה. But we cannot deduce from the translation of the Lxx. what they considered to be ill-becoming to translate literally, and we find in one part of the Pentateuch some words paraphrased, and in another part the same words literally translated. This proves that it was not a *plan* agreed upon to avoid anthropomorphism, but that each translator worked independently, according to his own views, and it seems that there

* Διὰ ἁμαρτίας ὁ θεός.

could not have been any common revision and comparison of the complete translation, or else the most striking discrepancies^a would have been corrected.

The translator of Numbers translates *עַל פִּי יְהוָה*,^b 'by mouth of the Lord,' by *διὰ φωνῆς Κυρίου*; but *עַל פִּי אֱלֹהִים* by *διὰ στόμα Ἀαζών*. We cannot understand why a voice proves God to have less similitude with men than the mouth, since the idea of exhibiting sounds of words to the human ear conveys with it the idea of organs of speech by which the sounds are produced.

The same translator translates the priest's blessing to the people of Israel quite literally, although there a wish is expressed 'that the Lord may lift up his countenance.' The phrase *יִרְאֶה יְהוָה* (Num. ii. 1) he translates *ἑαντι Κυρίου*, but the immediately following word *וַיִּשְׁמַע*, 'and he heard it,' he translated literally. So the word *יָד*, 'hand,' *χείρ*, although the hand is a member by which man is distinguished from other animals, and which expression, if used of God, must lead to the belief of similitude between man and his creator. The 8th verse in chap. xii. is translated literally, *στόμα κατὰ στόμα*, but *וַתִּבְרָא יְהוָה יְבִישׁ וְהִמַּחְתָּ יְהוָה יְבִישׁ*, 'and the similitude of the Lord shall he behold,' by *δὲ ὁ ξαν Κυρίου εἶδε*.

The fourth book of Moses abounds in such wilful translations, and it would exceed the space which can be afforded in this Journal were we to cite and to account for all the passages which are wilfully altered. The reader may soon satisfy himself of the accuracy of this statement by a careful collation of the Hebrew text with the Greek translation. We must reiterate our own firm persuasion that many of the Greek translators made choice of this method of paraphrasing only from the habit, even from their youth, of not pronouncing the name of Jehovah, and not even writing the current translation of it, but substituting another word or a whole phrase for it. The Talmud (*Tract. Kiddushim*, 71) tells us 'that there existed from ancient times three different names to express God's being; one is the tetragrammaton, or the name of four letters; the others we find not in the Bible, but

^a One instance of such a mistake, by which we can see that the translators of the LXX. translated independently, is the number of the persons with whom the patriarch Jacob came to Egypt. The translator of Exodus counts 75, and that of Deuteronomy 70 (Exod. i. 5; Deut. x. 22).

^b Sometimes the same phrase is translated *ἐκ τῶν ὀστέων Κυρίου* (Num. ix. 18, 20, 23).

the one consisted in 12 letters, and the third in 42 letters. The common people were prohibited from pronouncing the tetragrammaton, but in the schools they used to do it. The doctors taught their sons and disciples to pronounce it once in a week.* The name of 12 letters was originally taught every man, but in the latter times only to those among the priests who were capable of keeping it in secret. The name which consisted in 42 letters was considered as the most holy one. The Talmud says, 'Whoever is initiated in this mystery, and keeps it in a pure heart, is sure to possess the love of God and the favour of men; his name commands esteem; he never forgets his knowledge; and he inherits eternal life.'

But not only in translation, but by paraphrase of Scriptural passages, have some of the translators striven to reconcile their own philosophical opinions with Scripture. We think that the translator of Numbers was one of these. We apprehend this point to be proved in chap. xvi. 30: we are told in that verse that God was willing to testify his choice by a new creation (ברִיאָה), by a miracle, which is against the established laws of nature; the earth should open her mouth, and swallow up *only* those persons who were rebellious against God; but the Alexandrian philosopher is very cautious in his translation of this passage, and he does not translate 'but if God will create a creation,' but 'if God will appear in a vision,' ἀλλ' ἢ ἐν φάσματι δείξει Κύριος. We have said before that בָּרָא, 'to create,' is sometimes applied to things which have been created after the great bodies of the universe have been called into existence by

* וְאָמְרֵי לָהּ, 'once in a week' Others of the Rabbis say, פַּעַם אַחַת בְּשָׁבוּעַ, 'twice a week.' But we think that the word שָׁבוּעַ, which is commonly translated by 'week,' must in our passage be translated by '7 years,' like the passage in the Talmud, tract. *Joma*, 11 a: מְזוּזוֹת יְחִיד נִבְרָאת פַּעַמִּים בְּשָׁבוּעַ, 'The passages of the Pentateuch which are fixed to the door-posts of Jewish dwellings must be revised once in 7 years (שָׁבוּעַ) if it belongs to a private person, but twice in 49 years if to the whole community;' 'once in a week' is in the Talmud generally expressed by פַּעַם אַחַת בְּשָׁבָת, and 'twice in a week' by פַּעַמִּים בְּשָׁבָת. This explanation agrees with that of Maimonides in his *Guide of the Perplexed* (ch. 26). He says, 'The name of God, which consisted of 12 letters, was taught to every learned man, which was not the case with the name of 4 letters, which was only handed down to their sons and disciples once in 7 years.' Another passage from the same writer's book proves that in the latter times they have also been cautious in the teaching of the name consisting in 12 letters (chap. 62), 'But in the latter times, when wicked men (אֲנָשִׁים פְּרוֹצִים) spread false doctrines through their acquaintance with the name of God consisting in 12 letters, they concealed also this name like the first one.'

the word of God;⁴ but we find no passage in the Bible from which it should appear that this word means 'to appear,' or 'to show,' or 'to manifest.' When, therefore, the translator renders it by *δειξω* or *καταδείξω*, he reasonably could have no other reason than that which his philosophy dictated to him. He reflected upon it, and decided for himself, that the sacred writer (who, according to the Alexandrian philosopher's opinion, was the greatest of philosophers) could have had no intention to express that God would *create* a *creation*, since the miracle happened in the world already created, not consequently against the common laws by which nature acts; but he meant to say, that God will appear in a vision, which is just as much as to say: Moses, the great Jewish legislator, who was the highest and the most prominent of all the prophets, has had an intimation from God, by the great intellectual powers which 'the absolute existence' has largely imparted to him, to show something which will destroy all the rebels who have rebelled against the 'absolute being.' Who will deny that the translation of this passage is an example of intentional paraphrase, designed to make the text suit an imaginary doctrine invented by men who looked for wisdom in the union of Judaism with 'Grecian degenerated philosophy?' But not only the verse we have quoted proves the probability of our opinion; there are many other passages in almost every book of the Alexandrian translation.*

The translator of Numbers seems to have been sometimes careless in translating the original words exactly, and so he contradicts himself by rendering similar passages differently. One instance is chap. xvi. 5, 'And he spake to Korah and to all his company, saying, Even to-morrow the Lord will make known who is his, and the holy he will cause him to come near to him;' *Καὶ ἐλάλησε πρὸς Κορὲ καὶ πρὸς πᾶσαν αὐτοῦ τὴν συναγωγὴν, λέγων, ἐπέσκεπται καὶ ἔγνω ὁ Θεὸς τοὺς ὄντας αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς ἁγίους καὶ προσηγάγετο πρὸς ἑαυτόν.* The English Bible agrees with the Hebrew, so the Syrian and the Arabic Bible, but the Greek differs: *בָּרָךְ*, 'to-morrow,' the Alexandrian read *בָּרַךְ*, *ἐπέσκεπται*, 'he has considered,' *consideravit*, *עָרַךְ*,

⁴ Whether *בָּרָךְ* means to create from nothing or not, the creation from nothing was not a silly theory (as Dr. Lee calls the opinion of creation from nothing—see his *Lex. art. בָּרָךְ*), but it was a chief article of faith; and so we are told by the apostle Paul 'that by faith we know that the world has been created by the word of God.'

* We confine ourselves at present to the Pentateuch alone. We may at another opportunity discuss the other parts of the Holy Scriptures.

‘and he will make known;’ καὶ ἔγνω, ‘and he knew,’ *novit*, וְיָדַע, ‘and the holy,’ (sing. numb.); καὶ τοὺς ἁγίους, *sanctos*, (pl. numb.); בּוֹ, ‘him;’ τοὺς, *them*;’ εὖς (pl. numb.). If we examine carefully the nature of Korah’s sedition, we learn that he was agitated by a sordid passion of envy and by a craving for honour among men; he was by no means zealous for the well-being of the holy congregation, as he politically called his nation; he coveted the honour done by the Israelites to Moses, and did not make any secret of his longing desire, but complained openly, ‘Wherefore uplifted ye yourselves?’ His struggle was to be acknowledged by his nation as a נָשִׂיא (prince), ‘the uplifted one.’

Moses answered Korah, that the next day the Lord would make known (*i. e.* by the manifestation of his choice of the one and rejection of the other, the Lord’s knowledge would be proved) who it was whom he had chosen to be the uplifted one in Israel. The Hebrew reading is confirmed by the Greek translation of verse 7, αὔριον, or מָחָר, or בֹּקֶר, or ‘to-morrow;’ ὁ ἀνὴρ (sing.), ὁ (sing.), οὗτος ἅγιος (sing.). In verse 13 two words are broken off, and added to verse 14, and badly translated. The English Bible renders the words in question by, ‘except thou make thyself altogether a prince.’ The Hebrew words are בִּי תִשְׁתַּיֵּר עָלֵינוּ נִם תִּשְׁתַּיֵּר;

so ends verse 13 in the Hebrew text, and so the Syriac, Arabic, and Samaritan Bible, and the Vulgate. But in the Greek translation, verse 13 ends with οὐ κατὰρχεῖς ἡμῶν, and verse 14 begins with Ἀρχων εἶ, ‘Thou art a prince.’ The repetition of the Hebrew word seemed to have startled the translator; and to get rid of a seeming difficulty, he added one word to the following verse as a kind of introduction, changed the verb שָׂרָר into the substantive שָׂר, ‘a prince,’ and the word נִם he left untranslated. Often he translates the same word differently; עֶנֶק (*Anak*) is translated sometimes γίγας, ‘giant,’ and sometimes he left it as a proper noun untranslated (comp. Numb. xiii. 29, 34). In chap. xiv. 20 we read that God swears not only by his own life,^f but also by his own name, which oath is not only against the Hebrew text,

^f It is worth noticing that the men of the Masorah have made a difference between the oath-form uttered by God and that by men, *e. g.* Gen. xlii. 15, הָיִי פָרְעֹה; 1 Sam. i. 26, הָיִי נַפְשִׁיךָ, ‘by the life of thy soul,’ never הָיִי יְהוָה, ‘by the life of Jehovah,’ but הָיִי יְהוָה, ‘as truly as Jehovah is living;’ it seems that the reason of the difference is, that God and his life or existence are not two independent existences, as it is with man’s life, which animates the body, and the body which forms an individual, of itself.

but also against strict monotheism. The Hebrew text is **וְיָנִי** **וְיָנִי**, 'but as truly as I live;' *ἀλλὰ ζῶ ἐγὼ καὶ ζῶν τὸ ὄνομά μου*, 'yet I live and my name lives.'

Wilful mistranslations are very numerous in this book of the Pentateuch; but since our space and our time permit us not to examine here all those numerous mistakes and words and meanings substituted for a mere gratification of fancy, we shall give a few remarks on the rest of the Pentateuch.

The translator of Deuteronomy gives for the most part a very literal translation, and it seems that he has taken great care to keep close to the Hebrew text, yet he could not avoid, like his co-operators in the translation, paraphrasing passages which ascribe to God members of the human body; so he translates **וּבְכֹל דְּבַר**, not like the translator of Numbers, 'through the voice of God,' but 'through the word of God,' *τῷ ῥήματι Κυρίου* (Deut. i. 26; xxxiv. 5); and this translator also was inconsequent in his mode of avoiding anthropomorphism. He translated the same phrase literally, when he wanted to explain a Hebrew obscure expression, as in the well-known verse in Deut. viii. 3, 'but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord.' The Hebrew word **מִפִּי** means 'that which is proceeding,' part. pres. *hiphil* of **פָּ**; and if we were to translate the verse literally, we must say, but by that which proceedeth out of the

* The Hebrew text never uses the oath 'as truly as my name is living;' the Hebrew word **וְיָנִי** signifies 'nomen,' name. When it is said (Exod. xxiii. 21) 'for my name is in him,' it means as much as, 'obey him, because he is sent by me or in my name.' 'And Haggai prophesied in the name (**וְשֵׁם**) of the God of Israel' (Ezra v. 1), i. e. he prophesied the words which he has received from God, and was ordered by God to prophesy in his name. In *Midrash Tanchumah ad* Exod. iii. 13 is the following explanation given: 'Moses asked God for his name, and God answered him, Thou desirest me to tell thee my name? I am called according to my works. When I judge men I am called **אֱלֹהִים** Elohim; when I am engaged in battle against the wicked, I am called **שֶׁבַח** Sebaoth; and when I have compassion with man on account of his transgressions, I am called **אֱלֹהֵינוּ** Almighty God. The Cabala substituted the word **וְיָנִי** instead of **וְיָנִי**: the passage in Zechariah, 'In that day Jehovah and his name will be one,' seems to have been the occasion for the above denomination; we find large dissertations in cabalistic books on this subject, especially in the *Zohar*, which may be considered a very profound book on the Cabala. The cabalistic 10 Sephiroth are, as many modern cabalists assure us, answering exactly to the 10 different names of God which are mentioned in Holy Scripture. The book *Pardes Rimmon*, 2nd gate, expresses the above in the following words: 'The names of God are the Sephiroth; and we do not mean to say, the names are belonging to the Sephiroth, but the Sephiroth and the names are the names of the infinite One (**אֱלֹהֵינוּ**), according to his works.'

mouth of God. The Greek translation is ἀλλ' ἐπὶ παντὶ ῥήματι τῷ ἐκπορευομένῳ διὰ στόματος Θεοῦ. It seems that the translator of the fifth book of Moses was exceedingly careful to avoid expressions from which it might appear that the Jewish legislator had commanded severity towards other nations; and also to show that the Jews were bidden by God himself to acknowledge no other king except God alone. Hence he substituted in chap. vii. 16, where it is said כָּל הָעַמִּים אֶתְּ אֵתְּ אֲכָלֶתָּ, 'and thou shalt consume all the nations;' καὶ φαγῇ πάντα τὰ σκυῶλα τῶν ἐθνῶν, 'thou shalt consume the spoils of all people.' In chap. xii. 2 the word הָעַמִּים, 'the nations,' is not at all translated; and since neither in the preceding verse 11, nor in the beginning of verse 12, is there any substantive, we do not know whose places of idolatrous worship the Israelites were ordered to destroy. Chap. vii. 24, 'He shall deliver their kings into thine hand, and thou shalt destroy their name from under heaven;' וְתָתַן מַלְכֵיהֶם בְּיָדְךָ וְהָאַבְדָּתָ אֶת שְׁמֵם מַמְלַחַת הַשָּׁמַיִם. Καὶ παραδώσει τοὺς βασιλεῖς αὐτῶν εἰς τὰς χεῖρας ὑμῶν, καὶ ἀπολεῖτε τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ τόπου ἐκείνου.' What was the reason of this alteration? Nothing else but to mitigate the severity which appears to be expressed in the commandment, to destroy the nations from under heaven. In chap. xvii., where the Jews were ordered to choose a king from amongst their own brethren, in the case they should desire to have a king like unto those of the nations around them, the translator substituted ἄρχων instead of βασιλεύς, or מֶלֶךְ or king.^a

In Deut. ix. 13 we read a few words which are not in the Hebrew Bible, and there is no analogy, to our knowledge, of such a phrase in the entire Scripture: Ἀελάληκα πρὸς σὲ ἅπαξ καὶ δὶς, 'I have spoken to thee *once and twice*.' In verse 26 of the same chapter, יְהוָה יְהוֹנִי (Adonai Jehovah) is translated Κύριε βασιλεῦ. In verse 27 we read again a few words which are not in the Hebrew, and seem indeed to be needless, οἷς ὤμοσας κατὰ σεαυτοῦ. There are in these chapters many little words substituted without necessity, either in imitation of other scriptural

^a As often as the name of the abomination (מֹלֶךְ Molech) is mentioned in the Pentateuch, the LXX. renders it by ἄρχων, 'a prince.' We may look through the whole of the Pentateuch without finding there any such name; and if the translator has also not made a kind of political contrivance of it, to show that the Israelites are not permitted to give their children to the king (comp. Lev. xxvi. 3), we at least could not know from it that they had at any time such abominations as to burn their children to an idol.

passages, or to render the sense more intense. It is worthy of the reader's attention that the translator of Deuteronomy seems not to have been liable to that great error of changing the letter **resh** into **daleth**, which we find in almost every book of the LXX. translation, except once when he reads *Misadai* instead of *מיסדרה*; this is, indeed, of no great consequence, since it is only a proper name of a place; but he seems also to have changed an **ayin** for a **resh**. In chap. xi. 22, **כִּי אִם שָׁמַר תִּשְׁמְרוּ אֹת**, 'For if ye shall diligently keep all these commandments;' *Kai ἔσται ἐὰν ἀκοῇ ἀκούσῃτε*, as if **שָׁמַר תִּשְׁמְרוּ**; the same change of letters has probably taken place in chap. xxviii. 58, and xxxi. 12. Sometimes he changed **alef** into **daleth**, as in chap. xxxi. 15, where he translates *Kai κατέβη Κύριος*, as if the Hebrew were **יֵרֵד יְהוָה**, when it is **יֵרָא**; the whole verse is indeed artificially altered. It appears to us that the translator of Deuteronomy has sometimes laboured to reconcile tradition with Scripture; traces of this may be found in the last song of Moses. In chap. xxxii. 8 we read, 'When the Most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when he separated the sons of Adam, he set the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel' (**לְמִסְפָּר בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל**); this reading we have also in the Syriac, Arabic, and in the Samaritan Bible; but the LXX. renders it *Katὰ ἀριθμὸν ἀγγέλων Θεοῦ*, 'according to the number of God's angels.' This strange translation seems to be based on a tradition that 70 nations are in the world, and that each nation is under the power of an angel, but 'the children of Israel are not under the power of an angel; for God alone is their head; he has chosen them to be his own people.'¹

In verse 4 of the same chapter, **הוּא**, 'he,' (the 3rd pers. masc. sing.) is translated *Kύριος*, as if **יְהוָה**. The first part of verse 5 is badly translated: it runs thus, **שָׁחַת לוֹ לֹא בְנֵי מוֹמִים**, 'They have corrupted themselves; their spot is not the spot of his children;' *Ἠμάρτοσαν οὐκ αὐτῷ τίκνα μωμητά*, 'They have sinned, but not to him, O ye spotful children;' or, 'peccaverunt, non ei, filii vituperabiles:' this translation seems to have been occasioned by the first **לוֹ**, which means 'to him,' being mistaken for the second **לֹא**, which means 'not;' the sound is the same, but the meaning is quite different; the two last words, **בְּנֵי מוֹמִים**, can by

¹ Zohar ad Exod. xxiii. 20. Yet we find in the book of Daniel that the angel Michael said, that he stands to help Israel.

no means be translated as it is in the Greek, for בְּנָי, 'his children,' is in *status constructus*, therefore it can have no epithet besides the *status constructus*, as it is here the case with the word מוֹקֵם, 'their spot.' Verse 9 is also altered, 'for the Lord's portion is his people; Jacob is the lot of his inheritance:' this translation agrees exactly with the Hebrew; but the Greek has, Καὶ ἐγενήθη μερὶς Κυρίου λαὸς αὐτοῦ Ἰακώβ· σχοίνισμα κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ Ἰσραήλ. Verse 10 is paraphrased for the sake of avoiding anthropomorphism; instead of saying, 'he found him in a desert land,' the Greek says, 'he provided for his necessities in a desert land,' exactly like the translation of Targum Onkelos. Verse 12 is also considerably altered: the Hebrew is exactly like the English translation; there was no strange God *with him* (עִמּוֹ); so the Syriac, Arabic, and the Samaritan Bible; but the Greek changed עִמּוֹ, 'with him,' into עִמָּם, 'with them,' and the sense becomes quite different; instead of 'no other God was with him,' it is 'God alone brought them out, and there was no strange God *with them*.' The Alexandrian Jew believed in one God because he was a philosopher, and therefore he was cautious even to think the possibility of making use of terms which might be construed against strict monotheism, although the prophets use such language very often (Isa. lix. 41). In verse 40 we are told in the Greek translation, that 'God has sworn by his right hand,' but not so in the Hebrew text. A strange translation is given for the word פָּרְעוֹת (pharaoh) in verse 42. It is very likely that the Alexandrian held the word to be an appellative noun for 'kings,' because the Egyptian kings had the name of Pharaoh as their title; hence he translated ἀπὸ κεφαλῆς ἀρχόντων ἐχθρῶν: the English Bible translates the phrase, מֶלֶךְ פָּרְעוֹת אֱוִיב, into 'from the beginning of revenge upon his enemy.' We think that their translation of this passage is also inexact; פָּרַע means 'to loose,' 'to disturb,' or 'to destroy' (Num. v. 18; Exod. v. 4; Judg. v. 2); in the present passage it must be translated 'from the head of the rebellious enemy.'

The next following verse contains a passage which is not in the Hebrew text, and it seems to be an imitation of a passage in the Psalms and in Isaiah; the place in question runs thus, 'Rejoice, O ye nations, with his people, for he will avenge the blood of his servants, and will render vengeance to his adversaries, and will be merciful unto his land, and to his people.' The Greek translation runs thus, 'Rejoice, ye heavens, in the same time with him, and all the angels of the Lord worship him; rejoice, ye nations;
with

with his people, and all the sons of God strengthen him, because he will avenge the blood of his sons; and he will avenge, and will retribute vengeance to the enemies, and punish the despisers; and the Lord will thoroughly purge the land of his people.' None of the versions have these words we read in the LXX.; and they stand here like a needless patch. We find no analogous text in the Pentateuch, where the heavens are called upon to rejoice or to sing, and Moses was not so liberal with the phrase, בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים, 'sons of God,' and מַלְאֲכֵי אֱלֹהִים, the 'angels of God,' as was the Greek translator of Deuteronomy. So is verse 44 quite needless, because it is only repetition of verse 22 in chap. xiii. In chap. xxxiii. 2 we meet again with words which are not in the Hebrew text, and seem to have been intended to paraphrase the words, אֵשׁ דָּת, 'a fiery law,' which the LXX. renders by ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ ἄγγελοι μετ' αὐτοῦ; also the phrase, 'and they sat down at thy feet,' is rendered, Καὶ οὗτοι ὑπὸ σὲ εἰσὶ. We must remember that the 10 commandments, according to the translation in Deuteronomy, answer to the original more strictly than does the translation of the 10 commandments in Exodus.^k

EXODUS.

כֹּה יִהְיֶה לְךָ אֱלֹהִים אַחֲרַיִם עַל פְּנֵי
בְּכֹר אֶת אֲבִיךָ וְאֶת אִמְךָ לְמַעַן יֵאָדָּעוּ
יְמִיךָ עַל הָאֲדָמָה

Οὐκ ἔσονται σοι θεοὶ ἕτεροι πλὴν μοῦ·
τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου, καὶ τὴν μητέρα σου,
ἵνα εὖ σοι γένηται· καὶ ἵνα μακρο-
χρόνιος γένη ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς τῆς ἀγαθῆς.

DEUTERONOMY.

לְמַעַן יֵאָדָּעוּ
לְךָ

Οὐκ ἔσονται σοι θεοὶ ἕτεροι προπρω-
σου μου· = עַל פְּנֵי.
τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα σου
ἵνα μακροχρόνιος γένη καὶ ἵνα εὖ σοι
γένηται ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

We have endeavoured to show from numerous passages of the Pentateuch that our opinion of the translators, who came from Jerusalem to Alexandria to translate the Jewish law, is a correct one. They were instruments of their own interests, and not of the Holy Ghost. The original Hebrew text was to them not the word of God, which must not be touched by the forwardness of man, but they moulded the text so as to suit their own conceits. Besides this fact, we are told by Aristeas that the LXX. did not only translate, but also interpret the Bible; indeed, there are many small words substituted for which we cannot account, except

^k We give here only those passages where the Hebrew differs from the Greek, and where the translations are different.

that

that they are simply to make a seeming dark passage intelligible, and by this means they engrafted upon what became the current version of the Scripture fancies of their own—which, alas! too often came to be regarded by many of the Christian church as essential parts of the word of God, while not a few have been so grievously misled as to raise the Septuagint to the same level with the original Hebrew, if not to give it a higher place.¹ We know that there have been, and still are, men who believe that the blessings of God have accompanied the translation of the LXX.; and we do not deny that it was so, but we are fully persuaded that the translation of the LXX. is not only not an inspired one, but also not free from partiality, impure intentions, and little regard for the sacredness of the original word.

‘But have not our Saviour and his apostles taken their quotations from the Alexandrian translation? Are not their words in every quotation the very same which we have now in all the manuscripts and printed Greek Bible, which is commonly called the Septuagint?’ We answer, No; and this we say for several reasons. On the one hand, the Lord constantly referred to the Scriptures when in discourse with Pharisees and common Jews who were trained according to the tradition of this sect, and the pharisees סופרים

or scribes were very zealous—at least, they pretended to be so—for the maintenance of the law of Moses (Gal. i. 14), and probably for the letter in which the law was originally given. We have said already that in the times of our Saviour and his apostles an intense hatred prevailed throughout Judæa against the wisdom and language of the Greeks, and we cannot discover any trace, either in the Talmuds or in the Midrashim and Zohar, of Grecian civilization. We find in the Talmud several passages, where it is said, that reading other books except the 24th books of the Holy Scriptures, is just as much as being engaged in ‘vain conversation’ (דברים בטלים). The celebrated Rashi says, that the Grecian wisdom (חכמת יונית) consisted in a kind of language which the people of courts and diplomatists spoke, but which no other men understood.

There existed also amongst the Jews in the time of the apostles a strong aversion against the Greek language, especially after the Greek dominion in Syria had become to the Jews obnoxious and intolerable. We may suppose that the apostles submitted to the tradition of their fathers, and avoided learning a language which

¹ See Walton's Polyglotta, Proleg. 9, *De versionibus Græcis præcipue 70 seniorum*, 3.

² According to the current reckoning among the Jews.

was prohibited by the elders (Talmud, tract. *Baba Kama*, fol. 82):
 אָרֹר מְגִיד חַיִּים . וְאָרֹר הָאִישׁ הַלּוֹמֵד אֶת בְּנוֹ יוֹנִית , ' Con-
 demned be the man who keeps swine, and condemned be also the
 man who teaches his son Greek.'

We may learn from this remark what the Jews considered was Grecian wisdom; no wonder that the Rabbis called it 'vain conversation.' In another place of the Talmud is related, that Rabbi Jehudah Ha-Kadosh, the compiler of the Mishnah, was *allowed* to speak Greek, because of his being a friend to the king (*Baba Kama*, fol. 83): this dispensation granted to the great man, who was called κατ' ἐξουσίαν, Rabbi, proves sufficiently that the people were watched not to transgress against a commandment over which a curse hung. It is an undeniable fact that the religious tradition of the Jews speaks with a most embittered hatred against Grecian wisdom and language.^a The Syriac language was the prevailing one amongst the Jews in the time of Christ and his apostles, and we hear, several years after the crucifixion of Jesus, the centurion, with great astonishment, exclaim, 'Canst thou speak Greek?' The apostle Paul appeared to that centurion to be a prodigy of a learned man only because he was able to converse with him in a language in which the other Jews could not. On the other hand, we say that it is no proof at all that the LXX. is an inspired version because the passages which were quoted by the Lord and his apostles, agree with the translation of the LXX. Why should not Christ and the apostles have translated the Hebrew passages exactly like those Alexandrian Jews who translated the Bible for Ptolemy's library? If Christ and the apostle have spoken Greek, it was Hellenistic Greek; and if it be so, we do not see any impossibility that two different individuals, who speak the same dialect, should translate in a similar way passages with which both are familiar, even if these passages are taken from a language which is not vernacular. But we can prove that the greater part of those passages which are quoted in the New Testament are taken *verbatim* from the Hebrew text, and not from the Greek version. Yes, there are a good number of passages quoted by the evangelists and apostles which must have been taken immediately from the Hebrew text, because the Greek version gives just the diametrically opposite sense to that quoted by the apostles. We can only find space for

^a There exists a sentence from Rabbi Jehudah Ha-Nashi, which might perhaps prove the contrary; but if we compare this favourable opinion of the Greek language (*Baba Kama*, 82, 83 a) with that of the permission given to the same rabbi, the favourable opinion appears to be nothing but a polite sentence of a courtier. The passage runs thus, 'Why do we use the Syriac language in Judea? Use either Greek or Hebrew!'

a few instances, but we earnestly advise the reader who is acquainted with both languages, to collate the Hebrew text and the Greek version, and we are fully convinced that he will agree with us, that *there exists no version on which we can implicitly rely, and that the Greek version, commonly called the Septuagint, is among those least entitled to confidence.* In the very first chapter of the Gospel according to the evangelist Matthew, verse 23, we meet with a quotation from the 7th chapter of Isaiah, which agrees in a few words neither with the Hebrew nor with the Greek. In the New Testament the quotation runs thus, ἰδοὺ, ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἔξει, καὶ τέξεται υἱόν, καὶ καλέσουσι τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἑμμανουήλ; in the LXX. thus, ἰδοὺ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ λήψεται, καὶ τέξεται υἱόν, καὶ καλέσει τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἑμμανουήλ: the single difference is, that in the Hebrew is said וְקָרָאת, 'thou shalt call,' and in the New Testament is καλέσουσι, 'they shall call;' all the rest of the verse agrees exactly with the Hebrew. It is the same case with verse 5 in chap. ii. of the same Gospel. But the passage quoted in verse 15 answers the Hebrew reading, and not that of the LXX.; Ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ἐκάλεσα τὸν υἱόν μου, quotes Matthew, 'from Egypt I have called my son,' וּמִמִּצְרַיִם קָרָאתִי לְבָנִי; the Septuagint reads, τὰ τέκνα αὐτοῦ, 'his children.'^o

In chap. viii. 17, the same evangelist says that, whilst Jesus healed all manner of sickness, that was fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet Isaiah, Αὐτὸς τὰς ἀσθενείας ἡμῶν ἔλαβε, καὶ τὰς νόσους ἐξάστασεν, 'Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sickness.' This passage is in the Hebrew text of Isa. liii. 4, and runs thus, וְאֵן הָלִינוּ הוּא נָשָׂא וּמַכְאוֹבֵינוּ סָבַלָם; but the translation of the Septuagint is this, Οὗτος τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν φέρει, καὶ περὶ ἡμῶν οδυῖται, 'He bore our sins, and was tormented through us.' We think that there will be not one reader who would say that the evangelist has taken his quotation from the LXX., and not from the Hebrew; and we think that the version of chap. liii. alone ought to convince every Christian reader that the apostles and evangelists have learned the fulfilment of prophecy in Jesus Christ from the Hebrew text, and not from the Greek version.

^o The quotation (ch. ii. 23), it seems to us, can have been taken from the Hebrew text alone, and by no means from the Septuagint. St. Matthew says, Ὅτι Ναζωραῖος κληθήσεται, 'He shall be called a Nazarene.' Doubtless he refers to the original Hebrew in Isa. xi. 1, וְנִזְרַן מִשְׁרֹשֵׁיִן יִצְרֵחַ, V'nizer Mishrushof yifreh, and also ch. lx. 21, וְנִזְרַן מִשְׁעֵי, Nizer Mattai; the Septuagint translates the word נִזְרַן in Isa. xi. 1, ἐκ τῆς ῥιζῆς ἀναθήσεται, and in Isa. vi. 21 it is translated as if נִזְרַן, 'to guard,' or 'to keep.' In these different translations of the LXX. is no similarity to Ναζωραῖος, of which the Evangelist speaks in the above passage.

We have shown above that the necessity of Christ's sacrifice cannot be proved from the LXX., and we add here that the translator of Isaiah is actually a commentator on chap. liii., and he belongs to the class of interpreters who think Israel to be the subject of whom the prophet speaks; and hence he added several words which are not in the Hebrew Bible: verse 2 begins with the words, 'And he grew up,' (וַיַּעַל),^p but the Greek is ἀνγγεῖλαιμεν, 'We announce him.' Insignificant as this difference may appear to be, yet it is of great importance in this chapter, and it seems to us that the prophet has made choice of the verb עלה to intimate that the birth of the Messiah would be low and humble, like unto a tender plant (יֹצֵק), but not like a child, ὡς παιδίον,

^p Our English Bible translates וַיַּעַל, 'for he shall grow before him;' but וַי is here not copulative, but the ו *vav conversivum*, and changes the future tense into preterite. The future tense has the office of expressing events which are not finished, or about to happen, e. g. אָשׁוּב כְּעֵת חַיָּה, 'I shall return according to the time of life,' or אֲשֶׁר יִמְלֹךְ, 'who was about to rule,' *qui regnaturus erat*. The future tense with *vav conversivum* is always used when the verb precedes the nominative case, e. g. וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים, but where the substantive precedes the verb the preterite is used. We know only two or three instances where the future is used, although the substantive precedes it; 2 Sam. xv. 37, וַאֲבִישָׁלוֹם יָבוֹא, and Jer. lii. 7, וְכָל אֲנָשֵׁי הַמִּלְחָמָה יִבְרָחוּ. The passage in Job iii. 3, where Job uses the future tense in the curse of the day when he was born (אֲנִי לֵד), must be translated, 'when I shall be born.' He means to express a wish that the day in which he was born should not return again, and so the night: the following verses witness that we are right; he naturally could not desire that the day in which he was born should be exterminated, because it was a past one, but he speaks of the returning time in which he remembers his distress more than at any other time; and we think that Job neither carries himself back to the time when he was born, nor is it a peculiarity of the Hebrew idiom, but he says, O that I might die and not see again the day in which I was born, and was the cause of all the misfortunes which have befallen me; and so he goes on to curse his birth-day and its night, till verse 10, where he complains of his birth altogether. Jeremiah curses his very first birth-day, and therefore he adds, יוֹם אֲשֶׁר יִלְדֹתִנִּי אָמִי, 'the day wherein my mother bare me,' so as to make this distinct difference between his curse and that of Job to which the prophet seems to refer; so, לֵד יִשְׁמַעֲאֵל יְחִיָּה לְפָנָיִךְ, 'that Ishmael might live,' the verb יְחִיָּה is in the future tense, because it is the nature of wishes to require the future; so in Hebrew the future tense is used where we say, we ought, 'we must,' 'we are not allowed,' and 'it must not be done;' וְשֵׁשׁ לֹא יֵעָשֶׂה (Levit. iv. 13, 22, 28), 'which should not be done.' The extensive sense which the Hebrew future tense carries with it is because this language has no verbs auxiliary. It is also applied to express events which have never been brought to an end, nor are they drawing to an end now, e. g., Deut. ii. 2, רָפְאִים הָיוּ, 'which also were' (Heb. 'shall be') 'accounted giants as the Anakims, the Moabites call (Heb. 'shall call') them Emims.

as it is in the LXX. The last part of verse 4 is considerably altered, **וַאֲנַחְנוּ חֲשַׁבְנָהוּ מִכֵּה אֱלֹהִים וּמַעֲנָה**, 'Yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted;' but the Greek is, *Καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐλογισάμεθα αὐτὸν εἶναι ἐν πόνῳ, καὶ ἐν πληγῇ καὶ ἐν κακώσει*, 'But we did esteem him to be in evil and in stroke, and in illness.' Verse 9 runs thus, **וַיַּתֵּן אֶת־רַשְׁעִים קְבֹרוֹ וְאֶת־עֹשֵׂר בְּמֹתָיו**, 'And he made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death;' *Καὶ δώσω τοὺς πονηροὺς ἀντὶ τῆς ταφῆς αὐτοῦ, καὶ τοὺς πλουσίους ἀντὶ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ*, 'I shall give the wicked for his burial, and the rich for his death.' This translation proves, we apprehend, that the translator of Isaiah explained the chapter, which must have been indeed unintelligible before the fulfilment in Jesus, by substituting words of his own, and expounded it so as to make Israel the subject of the prophecy. We can not only say that the apostles could not have proved the sacrifice of Christ for his people, but, according to the Greek version, the prophet said that others will be made sacrifices for that individual of whom he prophesied. We know from numerous passages of the New Testament^a that its writers constantly refer to this chapter as to a source of information and knowledge concerning the suffering Messiah (**מָשִׁיחַ**); but they could not have done so if they had made the Septuagint the standard of revealed truth. In verse 18 of chap. xii. of Matthew's Gospel we read, 'Behold my servant whom I assist; my beloved, in whom my soul is well pleased; I will put my spirit upon him, and he shall show judgment to the Gentiles;' this is a very literal translation from the Hebrew, which runs thus, **הֵן עַבְדִּי אֶתְמַדְּ בּוֹ בְּחִירִי**; but the Septuagint begins this verse thus, *Ἰακώβ ὁ παῖς μου*. We perceive soon that the translator commentates; he was never at a loss for an explanation, simply because he did not esteem the sacredness of the original word. The first three verses of chap. xxiv., which are quoted by the evangelist Matthew, are in the LXX. so translated that Jacob should appear the prophet's subject, and hence the evangelist could have made no use of the Greek version.

In chap. xix. according to John, we read that in the piercing of Jesus' side was fulfilled what it was spoken by the prophet Zechariah, **וְהִבִּיטוּ אֵלָיו אֶת־אֶשֶׁר דָּקְרוּ**, 'they shall look on him whom they pierced;' but the LXX. renders it, *καὶ ἐπιβλέψονται*

^a See the article 'JEWISH COMMENTARIES ON ISAIAH, LIII. 13,' in No. XII. of this JOURNAL.

προς μὲ ἀνθ' ὧν καταργήσαντο, 'and they will look to me, because they have mocked.' In the Epistle to the Romans we read (Rom. i. 17), ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται, יְהוָה בְּאֵמָתוֹ יִחְיֶה; but the LXX. has, ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεώς μου ζήσεται, 'the righteous shall live by MY faith:' chap. ix. 33 also does not agree with the LXX. version (comp. Isa. lii. 7 with Rom. x. 15; 1 Cor. ii. and Isa. lxiv. 8; also Isa. lxiv. 4, Eph. iv. 8, Ps. lxxviii. 19). We have seen from these numerous quotations that the LXX. was not the Bible which our Lord and his apostles referred the Jews to, but that it was the original Hebrew Bible. There are other passages which are not directly cited as quotations, but they are an echo from the Old Testament. So, for instance, is the passage, 'the Lord is made our righteousness,' an echo of the passages in Jeremiah, יְהוָה צִדְקֵנוּ *Jehovah Zidkenu* (Jer. xxiii. 6, xxxiii. 16). But the LXX. translates these two most remarkable passages so that we, at least, cannot account for the alteration, if it was not a wilful corruption: καὶ τοῦτο τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, ὃ καλέσει αὐτὸν Κύριος, Ἰωσεδὲκ ἐν τοῖς προφήταις (Jer. xxiii. 6). The second, יְהוָה צִדְקֵנוּ, in chap. xxxiii., is entirely left out, with many other important passages. Hagg. ii. 7, חֲמֹדָת כָּל הָעַמִּים, 'and the desire of all nations shall come;' καὶ ἥξει τὰ ἐκλεκτὰ πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν. We may assert that all those passages which found a manifold echo in the spirit of the apostles, so that they applied them to the Christian dispensation, are in the Greek version so translated as to apply to the Jewish nation. This important fact supports our opinion that the translators were partial, and that our Saviour and his apostles made use of the Hebrew text, and not of the Greek version.

The result of our collation of the original Hebrew Bible with the Greek version, commonly called the Septuagint, is that we can by no means rest upon this translation so as to base any Christian dogma on it, because the translators made use of the Jewish philosophy, tradition, diplomacy, and cautious temporizing which were established amongst them after their return from the Babylonish captivity, and they did not simply translate the sacred word, but they expounded and commented on it. By this means they indeed displayed their own 'wisdom,' but flagrantly disregarded the sacredness of the original text. There exist also many proofs that even in the Synagogues of the Greek and Italian Jews the Greek version was never read. We may justly conclude from a passage in Justin that the Jews refused to read from the Greek version, and insisted upon reading the Hebrew Bible. He says, 'Necessarium quidem erat Hebræos sacros

sacros audientes libros non solis literis adhærere, sed ad reconditas eis prophetias respicere, per quas magnum deum et salvatorem generis humani J. Chr. adnuncient. Sed etiam si *insensatis* semet ipsos *interpretationibus* tradentes a recta usque nunc aberraverunt gloria, etc. Sancimus igitur licentiam esse *volentibus Hebraeis per synagogas suas* per græcam vocem sacros libros legere convenientibus neque fiduciam esse his, qui apud eos sunt expositoribus (comp. *ἐξηγητὰς* by Eusebius), *solam hebraicam tradentibus*, etc. Eam vero quæ ab eis dicitur *secunda editio*—*τὴν λεγομένην δευτέρωσιν*—interdicimus omnino utpote sacris non conjuncta libro, etc. Neque licentiam habebunt hi, qui ab eis majores omnibus (*ἀρχιφερειταί*) aut presbyteri forsitan vel magistri appellantur . . . hoc (sic, græcæ vocis lectiones) prohibere, etc.' (Nov. 46), Soalso in the preface to the Novella, ' . . . quod quidem *solam habentes hebraicam vocem*, et ipsa uti in sacrorum librorum lectione volunt, *nec græcam tradere dignantur*, et multum dudum tempus per hoc ad invicem commoventur.'

The Jews in Palestine rejected the Greek version in the very earliest times of its becoming known to them, and it is the opinion of a great modern German Jewish critic that the history of this translation was intentionally furnished with the pompous events, of which we are told by Aristeas, to insinuate it into their favour. But whether the honour done to the Alexandrian translators by King Ptolemy was a fact or not, we are fully persuaded that the cause of translating the Hebrew Bible was not for the glory of God, but the gratification of a king who put his honour in procuring as many books as possible to advance the cultivation of his subjects, and to make Alexandria the seat of learning and civilization. This was the first cause. The translation, indeed, was afterwards employed to convert great numbers of heathen, but this fact does not make the translation more exact, nor does it prove the inspiration of the translators. One single passage of the Bible will also suffice to convert the heart of a sinner, if it is God's pleasure; and if a man who lived for many years against the laws of God becomes converted because he has heard the verse, 'For I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that he should return from his ways and live;' that will prove as little the inspiration of the English Bible as the inspiration of the man who has told the sinner the above verse.

The word of God has the blessed power in itself, and it may be translated into any language or by any man; its spirit will not be changed when it is not wilfully corrupted; but that a part of the Septuagint has been carelessly and partially handled has been sufficiently shown in this article. Only one Bible is the inspired one, and this is necessarily the original Hebrew. Here we have the

the very words which the men of God have spoken, because they were impelled by the רוח ד' *Ruach Jehovah*, 'the Spirit of Jehovah,' so to speak; no translation of the Bible has the same unction or perhaps the same charm which the Hebrew exhibits, and not only because it is the nature of versions to fail in transferring the vital energy of the original work, but because the *spirit* which rests in the Hebrew words does not rest in the translation. The Greek version was made by men of various characters, and who shall guarantee us the purity of their intentions? The translation itself could partly have done so, but we have seen that the balance of proof bears all the other way. We close this article with the expression of an earnest desire that the study of the Hebrew language may be introduced into all our Christian schools, that it may become an essential part of study at least of those who prepare themselves for the ministry of the Word, and then the Bible will become the only standard of Christian theology.

T. A.

THE THEORY OF HUMAN PROGRESSION.

The Theory of Human Progression and natural Probability of a Reign of Justice. London; Johnstone and Hunter. 1850. 8vo., pp. 523.

THE settled monotony of our more serious literature has within the last year been broken up by two very remarkable publications, both mainly devoted to the discussion of social questions—'The Latter-Day Pamphlets' of Thomas Carlyle, and 'The Theory of Human Progression.' The former, the production of one of the most gifted and singular men that ever entered the field of human literature, and bristling with antagonism from its many-sided surface towards every compartment and almost every point of existing society, has commanded a wide attention, and roused from their wonted quiescence the moral sentiments in thinkers of all classes to a degree to which, perhaps, no literary production ever did before. The other, from the pen of a writer, so far as we can judge, new to the public, and who for the present has seen meet to remain personally unknown to it, has attracted little attention compared with its claims and merits. Whilst works on cognate subjects, not worthy to be named in connection with it, have been puffed in every quarter, our leading critical organs have passed it over with that neglect which sometimes marks the advent

advent of very unusual merit. That it is a book replete with inquiries and speculations altogether a-head of the tracks of thought familiar to the great majority of those who take upon them to be the instructors and literary guides of mankind, is very clear; to the more advanced thinkers of the times—amongst whom the main staff of the gentlemen of the press can by no means claim to rank—this will constitute its great recommendation, and to such we mean now to make some imperfect attempt at introducing it. They will find it combine the discussion of the profoundest with the most practically interesting subjects of thought. They will trace the mind of a *discoverer* at work throughout; and if he has often conveyed to his readers the first impressions he has received in those mental explorations, rather than the matured fruit of much protracted, vigorous, and carefully collated investigation, they will find in them a freshness and suggestiveness but rarely to be met with in more severely digested, and haply less vulnerable productions. The book is issued at an opportune era, and it must command the attention of thinkers. The deepest social questions, pressing for solution, now tax the powers of the best minds of the time. Social evils, which all our progressive legislation has failed to cure or almost even to palliate, are felt to demand a more radical treatment than they have hitherto received, if we would escape social anarchy and ultimate dissolution. To these evils our author is profoundly alive, and he has aimed at an exploration of their sources which merits to be characterised as fundamental. And though, as we shall immediately have occasion to show, we cannot concur in the basis on which he rests his hopes of a progressive social regeneration, we must say that he has impressed us with a fresh sense of its imminent urgency; and exposed, under a perfect flood of light, the injustice and cruelty of many of our social usages and prescriptive class-privileges. An intense love of truth and justice is evidently the paramount feeling in the mind of the author, and this combining with a full recognition of the peculiar claims of Christianity, inspires him with a high reverence for all that is really sacred, and a thorough disregard of all that is merely conventionally so.

Feeling that there is no interest of humanity which is not intimately connected with the solution of those great social questions which have arisen in our age, we shall proceed to examine the validity of that theory on which our author invites us to ground our expectations of the evolution of a 'Reign of Justice' among men. And in the first instance it will be necessary to present some statement of it to our readers.

The probability of a 'Reign of Justice' our author grounds on the expectation of an evolution of a Science of Justice. His
expectation

expectation that such a science is on the point of being evolved, rests on the logical and chronological order of the sciences, and the stage at which we have arrived in their evolution. It will be well to begin with our author's definition of Science :—

' *Science* is nature seen by the reason, and not merely by the senses. Science exists in the *mind*, and in the mind alone. Wherever the substantives of a science may be derived from, or whatever may be their character, they are portions of a science only as they are made to function logically in the human reason. Unless they are connected by the law of reason, and consequent so that one proposition is capable of being correctly evolved from two or more other propositions, called the premises, the science as yet has no existence, and has still to be *discovered*. Logic, therefore, is the universal *form* of all science. It is science with *blank* categories, and when these blank categories are filled up, either with numbers, quantities, and spaces, as in the mathematical sciences, or with the qualities and powers of matter, as in the physical sciences, mathematics and physics take their scientific origin, and assume an ordination which is not arbitrary. Science, then, wherever it is developed, is the same for the human intellect, wherever that intellect can comprehend it. It abolishes diversity of credence, and re-establishes unity of credence.'—pp. 13, 14.

Science, then, according to this description, includes only truth which the reason can intuitively perceive or deductively establish from what it so perceives as that which *must* be. It is important that at the outset the reader should thoroughly realise this, that he may have a clear perception of what the author means by 'the ordination of the sciences.' It is their transformation from the inductive form, or reasoning on a basis of merely observed facts, into the deductive form, on demonstration from a basis of necessary facts. By the one method, when we observe two events uniformly occur so many times as antecedent and consequent respectively, assuming the uniformity of nature, we infer that they will do so in future; by the other method, from what certain facts are in their very nature, we infer that certain other facts *must* follow; or from the ascertained powers of certain agents that they *must* produce certain effects. The necessary relations of *facts* constitute mathematical science, the necessary relations of *events* constitute physical science. The one deals with the relations of simple *being*, the other with determinate *action*. We now proceed to cite our author's classification of the sciences in the logical and chronological order of their development :—

'The sciences, classed on their complexity, must be classed in the following order :—

' 1st. The mathematical and force sciences.

' 2nd. The inorganic physical sciences, beginning with the most general and terminating with the most specific.

' 3rd. The

'3rd. The organic physical sciences, composed of vegetable and animal physiology.

'4th. The sciences that relate exclusively to man, and that treat of human action. These are (1) *non-moral*, political economy, which treats of the beneficial and prejudicial effects of human action; (2) *moral*, politics, which treats of the moral character of human action, whether that action be the action of a single individual towards another individual, or whether it be the action of a whole society, or portion of a society, with all the formality of legislation. Politics is, in fact, nothing more than the moral law which ought to regulate the actions of the individual, extended to the actions of men when associated as a political society, the same moral law being obligatory on multitudes that is obligatory on the individual.'—p. 199.

Our author then proceeds to state the grounds, in connection with this view of the order of the sciences, on which he holds 'a natural probability of a Millennium,' or reign of justice, to be based. These are—

'1st. The division and classification of human knowledge.

'2nd. The fact that the chronological order of the *discovery* of the sciences, is the same as the order of classification.

'3rd. The power of *correct credence* (knowledge) to produce *correct action*.'—pp. 199, 200.

After stating what he does not mean by a Millennium, he proceeds:—

'By a Millennium, we mean a period of universal peace and prosperity—a reign of knowledge, justice, and benevolence—a period when the condition of man upon the globe shall be the best the circumstances of the earth permit of, when the systematic arrangements of society shall be in perfect accordance with the dictates of man's reason, and when societies shall act correctly, and thereby evolve the maximum of happiness possible on earth.

'Let it be remembered that the progress of mankind in the evolution of civilization, is a progress from superstition and error towards knowledge. Superstition and error present themselves under the form of *diversity* of credence; knowledge presents itself under the form of *unity* of credence. Wherever there is knowledge, that knowledge is the same in all parts of the earth, and the same in substance whatever language it may use as the instrument of expression. The progress of mankind, therefore, is a progress from diversity of credence towards unity of credence. There is but *one* truth, *one* scheme of knowledge; and, consequently, wherever knowledge is really attained, diversity of credence is impossible. Where men differ in credence, they differ because one or all have *not* knowledge.'—pp. 200, 201.

'We have, then, to ask, "Into what branches is knowledge divided?" "What is the logical order of those branches in a scheme of classification?" "In what chronological order have the various branches been reduced to scientific ordination?" "At which branch are the most advanced nations *now* in the nineteenth century?" and

"What are the branches that yet remain to be reduced to scientific ordination, and in what *order* may we expect those future branches to be reduced to the form of *science*, which excludes diversity of credence?" —pp. 201, 202.

To the first question, 'Into what branches is knowledge divided?' our author answers, 'Into the facts of sensational and psychological observation, rational science, and history.' In neither of these two classes of *facts*, nor in history, which 'is a branch of knowledge *common* to every reality with which we are acquainted,' does he find the great element of human progression. This element he recognises in 'rational science' alone. The answers to the second and third questions, 'What is the logical and what the chronological order of the sciences,' will be found indicated in an extract given above. The sciences range themselves logically, and have been, in fact, developed in an order advancing from the simplest subjects, or those embracing the smallest number of combining elements, on to the most complex subjects, or those embracing the largest number of combining elements. Thus, for example, of the physical sciences, or those which deal with phenomena as the results of the action of physical forces or agents, the most simple is astronomy, because its phenomena embrace the fewest determining elements, and these in their action universal.

Our author's fourth question, 'At what branch or branches of knowledge are the most advanced nations now?' must, according to what he has laid down as the essential character of science, mean what branches have reached the stage of ordination. These he states, somewhat loosely, to be 'the mathematical and more general physical sciences.' Under these last seem to be included not only statics and dynamics, but chemistry, which has reached that measure of ordination 'in which its principles can be applied as the instruments of discovery in the science which stands next in order—viz., vegetable physiology, which is now only undergoing the process of evolution.' There thus remain to be reduced to ordination vegetable physiology, which takes in the new element of life; animal physiology, which takes in those of sensation and locomotion; and economics, which takes in the yet higher elements of rationality and volition; ere we reach politics or the science of justice, which takes in the yet additional element of responsibility.

As to the last question, 'In what *order* we may expect the evolution of these sciences?' our author holds that 'there is the strongest ground for believing that they will be discovered and reduced to ordination in the same order that they stand in the scheme of classification.'—p. 169.

'The

‘The natural probability of a *Reign of Justice* is based on the answers to these questions. If there *be* a scheme of knowledge, and if the past history of science proves that the sciences have been evolved one after the other in accordance with that scheme, we assert that there is nothing unreasonable in anticipating that the future progress of discovery will continue to go on in the same direction. On the contrary, we maintain that such anticipation is a fair, legitimate, and impartial inference from the facts before us.’—p. 202.

‘A political Millennium will take place whenever political truth is discovered and reduced to practice. . . . We affirm that, according to the past progression of mankind in other departments of knowledge and action, there are good grounds for believing that political truth *shall* be discovered and reduced to practice. In doing so, we treat political science, not as a mystery which refuses to be reduced to system, but as one of the sciences which it behoves man to study, *exactly in the same manner* that he would study dynamics or any other branch of knowledge.’—pp. 274, 275.

Our immediate concurrence in this anticipation, and by consequence in the theory we have endeavoured by these extracts to make intelligible to our readers, is barred by two difficulties. The first respects the adequacy of the powers of the human mind for the task in question; and the second, the nature of the subjects with which the sciences that yet await ordination have to deal.

Of our first difficulty we shall only offer one illustration, and that shall be drawn from meteorology—a branch of physical science which has not yet reached ordination—which is, in great part, in a condition little better than what our author would call ‘a superstition.’ Suppose we had reached the complete scientific determination of the whole range of action of the essential constituents of the atmosphere, combined with that of heat, electricity, and evaporation with all its resultant phenomena; it must be remembered that there is quite another class of agents constantly acting on the atmosphere, and affecting the equilibrium of its constituent elements. In the process of respiration animals are incessantly consuming its oxygen, and plants in their growth absorbing its nitrogen. Carbonic-acid gas is constantly in process of being evolved from the members of the one kingdom, and assimilated into the expanding tissues of those of the other. Now, though by these and similar compensatory processes, a balance is on the whole maintained, it is not a state exhibiting fixed proportions, but a series of ever variable states which oscillate around a mean. It varies diurnally with day and night, it varies with the seasons, it is liable to be affected by every relative increase or diminution of animal and vegetable life. The discovery of guano and the drainage loan will affect it in Scotland; and the fall of the primeval forests, before the advance of the

Anglo-Saxon, affects it in America. Every child that is born—nay, every blade of grass that springs from the earth—has its individual vital functions, which exercise their specific action on the surrounding air; and which, in a scientific ordination (involving, as such does, mathematical precision), would tell on the result. Who shall calculate, measure, and adjust such elements? The simple enumeration of the individual agents transcends the powers of the human mind; and, taking only the relative aggregates, they vary every day and every hour.

Yet meteorology occupies but the boundary line between the sciences which deal with purely physical being, and the sciences which deal with organized being. The phenomena presented by the lowest portions of organized nature are more complicated still. Meteorology has to deal, not with life, but only with some of the functions of life. The lowest vegetable organism presents a more complicated series of elements, calling for scientific determination before you can pronounce why it is just what it is, than the atmosphere does in order to the determination of the causes of its states. For the determination of the whole action of atmospheric agents on this organism is demanded, before you can fix the elements which have made it what it is—no bigger and no less; and, in addition, the influence of soil, the general laws of vegetable life, and those which determine it to be the species which it is—fix the specific characteristics of every individual belonging to that species, under whatever diversity of circumstances it may be reared. This complexity increases when we rise to the animal kingdom, which takes in all below it, and superadds the element of nervous sensibility and the power of locomotion. And yet, again, there is a new stage of complexity when we rise to man, and have to superadd the element of volition, with all its cognate and appropriate results.

Suppose, then, that throughout the whole of being action were purely physical, or determined by fixed quantities and definite proportions, though in that case the ordination of science, so as to embrace and reveal the entire mechanism of action and interaction throughout the whole range of that being, is conceivably possible; yet we must utterly despair as to the adequacy of the powers of the human mind for such an achievement; and, consequently, on this ground alone would be barred from concurring in our author's expectation of the speedy evolution of a science of justice. Still, on that ground we would not be warranted in pronouncing a science of justice impossible. But the nature of the elements that the sciences which yet remain to be reduced to ordination, and particularly a science of justice, must embrace, presents a yet greater difficulty.

The

The subject-matter of all science consists of phenomena and their relations (essences must ever elude the grasp of the human mind); and every phenomenon gives rise to three distinct questions, the answers to which embody three progressive forms of knowledge. The first question raised by any object is, *What is it?* The answer to this gives the distinctive characteristics of the object—those which *identify* it. The aggregate of answers to such questions constitutes the natural history of the world. The second question is, *How is it?* The answer to this question gives the visible antecedents and conditions of the object; and by comparison with the fruit of like inquiries, reveals the class to which it belongs. The aggregate of answers to such inquiries is inductive science. The third question is, *Why is it?* And we can find an answer to this question only when we arrive at the physical *cause* of the phenomenon. The aggregate of such answers constitutes deductive science—demonstration, the only form recognized as science by our author.

The phenomenon is first identified; we ascertain what it is in contradistinction from every other phenomenon and fact. We next inquire, how it obtains; and if we find it to be, not an isolated fact, but an invariable sequence of uniform antecedents, then our inference is that it *will* be as it has been—that these antecedents will continue to be followed by this consequent, as we have hitherto found them. But why this conclusion? Because we feel that there is something in these uniform antecedents, not only sufficient, but *adapted* to produce this consequent; and—conditioned as they are—to produce only this consequent. In other words, that it is produced by a *physical process*, which we now bend our whole strength to ascertain; and which, when—by the elimination of all extraneous and accidental circumstances—we reach the clear seeing of, we have got to perfect *science* in this particular, we feel that from those antecedents—conditioned as they are—there *must be* this consequent. Henceforth doubt is excluded; in the words of our author, ‘diversity of credence is abolished, and uniformity of credence re-established.’

In the opinion of our author, to this process there is no limit. At the conquest of each ascending tier of this ever complicating series of being we plant our feet there as on a rock, to attack the next above it, and so proceed, until we have achieved the intellectual conquest of the entire universe, and ascertained what everything is, how everything is, and why everything is. It is a splendid vision which for more than a moment may dazzle even a strong eye. But we must proceed to inquire into the conditions under which only it could be realised.

Supposing, then, a mind of powers adequate to such a task : the
action

action and interdependence of the entire phenomena which it is to reduce to scientific ordination must be physical. Physical action alone can be the subject of exact science. It can deal only with agents whose action is determinable by number, weight, and measure, whose combinations obey the law of definite proportions and issue in uniform products. How far in either direction—backwards or onwards—will such science carry us? In other words, how far we do recognise the reign of pure physical law? Backwards; what account can physical science give of the *origin* of phenomena? Can it trace to their origin imponderable forces? No; it can only reveal the laws which determine their action. Can it disclose the genesis of ponderable agents? It recoils powerless from all such attempts. It can only evolve the laws of their action, *taken as they are*, or the processes and combinations by which they produce their definite results. Physical science can deal only with the universe *as it is*, to the ultimate question whence? or *by what*? it can give no reply. But how far forwards will it carry us in dealing with what is—in solving the ascending evolutions of this cognizable world of being? As far as the unbroken reign of number, weight, and measure, of definite proportions and uniform products extends, and no further. In the order of the complexity of the phenomena with which it has to deal, chemistry is the most advanced science that has reached a measure of ordination, and crystallization the highest product of the action of purely physical agents.

But when we approach the lowest forms of organization we are met by quite a different order of phenomena. The reign of number, weight, and measure, is overborne by some higher fact—a power which we call *LIFE*—entailing quite a new set of conditions—a power, of the production of which all our researches have failed to give any physical account. All they have as yet served to achieve being, a very imperfect development of the action of physical agents, subject to these conditions: the cause of those peculiar conditions remaining unaccounted for. In these circumstances all we could reach would be, a scientific ordination of the conditions *vitality* adds to pure physical action. Do these conditions by their nature admit of such ordination? If the reader's idea of scientific ordination has become at all dimmed, let him turn back to the definition given of it at the commencement of this Article. Under the light of that definition, we answer; to our apprehension they do not: why; we shall now endeavour to show.

The lowest forms of organic life overbear and subordinate to their purpose the pure physical action of ponderable agents, and not as chemical action overbears mechanical, operating by affinities,
the

the products of which always embody definite proportions of the constituents; such action bearing the same purely *physical* character, and coming within the power of exact admeasurement, the same as mechanical action does. But here the reign of definite proportions is arrested, and yields to that of probabilities. All observation and research conspire to establish the fact, that in all species of organisms, vegetable and animal, there is what may be called a typical standard, round which the individuals range as to size, figure, &c., but no absolute invariable standard, as in the different forms of crystallization for instance, to which each individual of the species rigidly conforms. So far from this, no two individual organisms of any species are ever found exactly alike. Instead of obeying the law of fixed definite proportions, the organism assimilates to itself its appropriate constituent elements in the proportions accordant to its specific constitution. And when circumstances are favourable to the respective due proportions being obtained, the typical standard will be secured. But the organism will not die, far less lose its specific form, though the circumstances should be, within certain limits, and on any side, unfavourable to the due proportionate supply, the effect within those limits is only to produce a proportionate departure from the typical standard. Even the vegetable organism struggles against extinction—labours to accommodate itself to circumstances; as if, even here, an endowment of living being, as yet, far ahead—volition, were suggested and symbolized. Had all the individual organisms of each species rigidly conformed to some *fixed* standard as to form, size, and aspect, though this would not have enabled us to develop the causes which determine the conditions of *life*, or even of specific diversity, it might have brought within the sphere of possibility the scientific determination of those elements which, acting in subordination to the conditions in question, produce the specific product. But when each individual of a species differs somehow from every other, the limits of the human faculties seem to forbid the attainment even of this, and to render it impossible that we should ever ascertain in any individual case all the elements, and in their exact proportions, which have combined to produce this such one particular individuality; and far more impossible antecedently to determine the exact circumstances and agencies which *must* produce an organism of such a certain size, aspect, figure, and no other.

This law of mean proportions and mean results, in place of definite proportions and fixed results, pervades the whole of organized being. We see it in plants, in animals, in man, and in man not only in his organic constitution, but in his social and his moral action. Not only does the size and strength of the human
body

body present, in the same community from generation to generation, a remarkable conformity to a mean standard, but the deaths, the births, the marriages, and even the crimes, maintain from year to year a remarkably uniform mean proportion to the population. On the whole, we may conclude that, where the law of definite proportions yields to the law of mean proportions, there the domain of exact science (what alone our author will allow to *be* science) terminates. Where pure physical action is subordinated to a new and inexplicable power, there our method must change. Until, in any individual case, we can ordinate the exact forces of vitality—an achievement which the whole range of the manifestation of these forces seems to us to proclaim impossible—we must content ourselves with statistics instead of physics, and aim at determining from the widest available number of individual cases the law, not of invariable, but of mean results—a method under which the progress of inquiry and observation can only elicit an ever advancing probability—never yield certainty or an absolutely complete and perfect science unless all possible circumstances in all the possible combinations could be exhausted.

But if organization alone present such insuperable barriers to the scientific ordination of its phenomena, the case cannot simplify, but must complicate as we ascend, and have to add the concepts of new powers, each in its turn subjecting the action of all beneath it to a fresh inexplicable set of conditions—when we add nervous sensibility, sensation, consciousness, locomotion, volition, responsibility. All which concepts, with their respective conditions of manifestation, each as taking up and subordinating to itself, in its own appropriate measure, the action of all beneath it, must become matter of scientific ordination ere we can, *by this process*, reach the possibility of an evolution of a science of justice. By such a method *we must despair* of reaching a science of justice, and of realizing—if it is only thus to be realized—a reign of justice. But this is our author's method: we submit a sentence or two from the summary of his disquisition on the logical dependence and evolution of the sciences, as, if possible, more explicit than the exposition cited at the commencement of this paper. They will freshen the reader's perceptions of the bearing of the preceding argument, and may somewhat prepare for what follows :—

‘ We affirm that, beyond a doubt, the reign of justice is to be anticipated on the fairest principles of computation; and that the argument by which it is established will bear the closest scrutiny of the impartial reason. . . . We maintain that man has, within the range of his natural knowledge, sufficient means of determining, that if the course of human history continue ordinated on the same principles

ciples that may be inferred from a consideration of the past and present, then in the future there must be a time when *justice* shall be the regulative principle of the earth, and man shall carry it into systematic and universal operation.'—p. 268.

'Man first evolves logic and the mathematical sciences, then the inorganic physical sciences, then the organic physical sciences, and, last of all, he makes *man* his intellectual object, and endeavours to discover the laws of his functions. No matter how long or how short a time may be employed in the evolution, this is the necessary order in which the discovery of science must take place. And it would be quite as absurd for us now to affirm that politics cannot assume exactly the same form and certainty as the other sciences, as it would have been for men to affirm chemistry could not reach its present perfection when their attention was devoted to mechanics, and the region of chemistry was occupied by groundless superstition.'—pp. 276, 277.

Is this then our author's *only* method? Professedly, as the reader must clearly see, it is; but we do not deem him thoroughly consistent in his adherence to it. Political economy, as a branch of 'man-science,' he uniformly places before politics^a proper, or the science of justice, in the order of evolution, yet he once and again denies to the former his own characteristics of true science, characterising it as 'sensational and inductive' (p. 204), as a 'science purely inductive, which treats of the physical effects of human action, so far as those effects are to be discovered in the condition of societies' (p. 198). And he again and again places the science of equity on what is virtually an independent basis. And as most thinkers, we conceive, will regard the expectation of the evolution of a science of justice through the ordination of all the logically antecedent sciences, as untenable, it will now be proper briefly to examine this other basis.

'The science of equity is purely abstract, and treats of the universal principles which ought to regulate human action, so far as men can affect each other by their actions.'—p. 198.

'A distinction must necessarily be drawn between the science of politics and its application to *man*. The science is purely abstract and theoretic. It professes only to determine the trueness or falsity of certain propositions which are apprehended by the reason; and the reason may take into consideration this trueness or falsity without dwelling on the fact that man is a *moral* being, who ought to *act* in accordance with such principles. In this sense the science of politics is as purely abstract as geometry, which determines the general rela-

^a 'An evident distinction presents itself, which enables us to *classify* human action. We may ask, "What means will lead to a certain end?" and, "What is the end that *ought* to be produced?" We have here *two* social sciences, in each of which there is the same stable truth that prevails in all the other sciences, if man only can discover it, and reduce it to scientific ordination.' P. 195.

tions of figures, without in the slightest degree attempting to pronounce whether there are any real material objects to which its truth can be applied.'—p. 28.

Without staying to inquire into the accuracy of this description of geometry, or to ask whether there can be any conceptions of figures or their relations which are not originally derived from *some* kind of material objects (probably our author would not deny that diagrams on paper are a sort of material objects), we shall proceed at once to inquire whether such a science of equity as that thus described by our author is possible. And in order to do this, it will be necessary to subject to a somewhat searching scrutiny the nature of those 'universal principles,' those 'abstract propositions,' which 'the reason' can apprehend and apply to the ordination of a science of justice, without any specific reference to the action, or the *powers* of action, of any active being. What are the fundamental principles of this 'purely abstract science?' 'The universal principles that ought to regulate human action' (p. 198). What kind of human action are they to regulate? '*Moral*;' 'Politics treats of the moral character of human action' (p. 199); '*equity* is the object-noun of the science of politics' (p. 14). What does moral action pre-suppose? Over and above the power of recognizing and of ascertaining truth, it pre-supposes voluntary power in the agent, a measure of freedom from external restraint, and a susceptibility of emotional impression. Moral action is that action of such an agent for which he is responsible to an AUTHORITY; and is regulated by LAW, issuing from this authority, and sanctioned by rewards and punishments. The recognition of *such* law differs wholly in kind from the apperception both of abstract truth (what must be), and of truth of fact (what is). It is not science—the seeing of what IS, or of what MUST BE, but the feeling of what OUGHT TO BE, of what ought to be DONE—done by a being endowed with rationality, and with the power both of choice and action. If it be asked, how the mind comes to recognize an *ought* in relation to certain actions—how it comes to be possessed of the power of feeling obligation, obligation to do certain things, and to refrain from doing certain other things?—we can only answer, that it is an essential element in its constitution, equally inexplicable with, but no more so than, the power of perceiving that certain things being truths, certain other things must of necessity follow from them as truths. In other words, it is no more unaccountable that man is a moral being, than that he is a rational being; that he has a moral constitution, than that he has a rational constitution. Taking man, then, as we find him, as endowed with such a moral constitution, every moral conviction presents itself as embodying two elements.

Objectively

Objectively there is recognized some law, revealed, public, or conventional, fixing the moral character of actions; and, subjectively, there is the response to this law *as right*—the feeling that what is thus enjoined we *ought* to do. Politics, then, as the science whose ‘object-noun is equity’—‘which treats of the moral character of human [relational] action,’ respects man in his *active* constitution, and not in his intellectual. Its foundation-principle is not apperception of truth, but sense of duty.

A specification of actions which ought and which ought not to be done would form a code of laws; but a science of justice would justify to the reason, so as to extinguish all doubt or possibility of difference respecting it, that portion of the code which lays down the right actions of man in his entire relations to his fellows. ‘When we have considered what man *is*, we turn to what man *does*. . . . Here we have the same stable truth that prevails in all the other sciences, if man can only discover it, and reduce it to scientific ordination.’ Is this possible? Our author holds that it is. ‘It *must* be within the reach of man, or else we must admit that all rules of social action are purely arbitrary; that is, in fact, that there are *no* rules’ (p. 195). Without stopping to inquire whether a rule of action would be nullified *as* a rule, though it should have to remain in a sense arbitrary, we return to the main question, Is this possible? Can we have a science of justice such as we have a science of number, or a science of force, or a chemical science? We answer that we cannot, and because the data are essentially diverse. There is no determinate measure of moral emotions. Moral emotions differ not only in depth and range in different individuals, but in the same individual at different periods, according to the clearness of the mental perceptions, the power of associations, and the character of the moral habits. One’s estimate of justice is not only dependent on these elements, but on one’s circumstances, on the nature of the relations he sustains to his fellows, and on his sense of what is due from him in those relations. One man will regard an action as equitable which another will regard as unequitable. More than this: what would be just from one man towards another man, might not be just towards a second; and justice might demand towards a third a different regard and action from what was due to either of the former. Not only the actions of men in relation to their fellows, but the impressions and feelings, out of which action springs, should be governed by justice. But how variable are these! how liable to have their proper tone and equilibrium disturbed by selfishness, by prejudice, by passion, by hasty and one-sided impressions! Truly, if a reign of justice depends on *such* an evolution of a science of justice, here again we must despair of it.

But,

But, according to our author, 'the principles of equity' are found in 'abstract and universal convictions of the reason.' And what do these convictions respect? *Action*, moral action (p. 199). If there be such convictions, then they must appear in action—real moral convictions always do. Are we able to trace such an uniformity in that department of human action embraced under the category of equity, as such universal convictions could not fail to induce? The voice of history gives a melancholy prevailing negative to such a question. Our author holds that this is because 'politics has been hitherto little better than a superstition;' because there has yet been achieved no ordination of a science of justice. But *convictions* need no scientific ordination in order to secure their object. No process of rational deduction is required to intervene in order to the certitude of their reaching their end. The end is moral action, and true convictions directly impel the agent to it. They are made up of two correlative elements—the perception of right, and the feeling of obligation; the one respecting not abstract truth, but LAW; the other, springing not from an apperception of truth, but a conscious power of action.

That we should have a science of equity, then, such as we have a science of force, or a science of number, or of affinities and definite proportions, is, in the first place, impossible, and, in the second, though possible, would be irrelevant to the end. Though we could have a science of justice complete and fully ordained, with such a being as man is, we see no ground to conclude that it would ensure a *reign* of justice. We are not ignoring the influence of correct credence; so far otherwise, we hold, along with our author, correct credence, on the highest subjects, to be the stimulant to intellectual activity and the spring of real progression. But we recognize such power, not in the knowledge of abstract truth (pp. 274, 276), but of relational and moral truth. It bears somewhat against our author's conclusion, that 'rational science is the great element of human progression' (p. 203); that that truth which he as well as ourselves regards as giving the primary impulse to the highest mental action and all social progress, has received, not a scientific but an historical embodiment. 'Christianity is a religion of facts'—facts whose high significance and power are found in their relation to man's moral exigences. They are facts which commend themselves, not to the deductive reason, but to faith; and being purely of a supernatural character, never *can* become matter of ordained science.

Moral conviction is something broader than the mere credence of the reason. It takes in the rational element, to be sure, but it is as the life-functions take up chemical action, to subordinate

it

it to a higher and more comprehensive fact. Moral conviction not only commands man, as a rational being, capable of apperception of *truth*, but as an active being, capable of performing *duty*. As it is the rightful function of conscience to take the supreme direction of all the active powers, so the convictions that are felt in the conscience spring out of the combined exercise of all the mental powers, perceptive, rational, and emotional. There is something here which our author overlooks, when, as a leading principle of his scheme of human progression, he pronounces '*knowledge* to be the only means given to man to evolve correct action' (pp. 274, 278). We recognize, indeed, in 'correct credence, the power to produce correct action' (p. 200); but it is credence, not in the form of science, but of faith: it is a credence generated in the combined action of the rational judgment and the moral emotions.

Thus, though it were possible to complete and reduce to perfect ordination the entire circle of the sciences; and though every man's intellect were competent to embrace and retain the gigantic whole; though this might abolish superstition and false evidence, it would by no means of necessity abolish the domination of selfishness or of sensual appetites; but until both of these—the former not less than the latter—be subordinated to the dominion of the moral sentiments, a reign of justice is impossible. For we affirm, that it is only through expansion and elevation of the moral sentiments that a reign of justice can be secured, because the development of pure equity, by the necessary sequence of these sentiments, presupposes that of the personal and private virtues; as the development of a science of animal physiology prerequisites that of a science of vegetable physiology; as the more comprehensive must ever embrace the more special and limited. Industry, economy, temperance, continence, may all be cultivated on selfish motives; so may courtesy and honesty, according to the conventional standard; but true equity cannot. It demands the subordination of selfishness not less than that of the propensities and passions. That unfailing *test* of the equity of *intention*—'*Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them,*' cannot as a practical rule reach a complete consilience with justice until, not only lust, but selfishness, is subdued—until we have formed a perfectly fair estimate, not merely of what in every case is due to others, but also of what (and no more) is due to ourselves—by far the more difficult attainment of the two—in fact, the last fruit of high moral discipline.

The extended culture of the personal virtues—industry, forethought, self-control, concurrently with a prevalent unsubdued selfishness, has, by the aid of a vastly increased command over
the

the powers of nature, through an advanced physical science, induced that phase of social development which may be designated the 'Economical,' under which the paramount object is GAIN, and the quintessence of regulative morals, to 'Buy in the cheapest market, and sell in the dearest'—a rule which, so far from being consistent with justice, is only the generalized expression of a reign of selfishness. How much of hidden injustice on the one hand, and of moral weakness on the other, stands revealed when we explore the causes which have produced this 'cheapest' market in which to buy!

In the earlier stages of society, command over the thews and sinews of others was acquired by superior strength or superior cunning; and during the feudal ages it became consolidated into a hereditary inheritance through the growth of the sentiment of loyalty, or reverence for prescriptive power. But in the economical era, the power of the feudal chief is transferred to the monied chief, and capital now takes the place of physical prowess—capital accumulated through inheritance, through credit, and through speculation; which last is just an adroit mode of making yours mine, more quiet and respectable than the chieftain's foray, but not a whit more honest. The culmination of the monied interest, with the representatives of the feudal power still upon the stage, has, in conjunction with other causes, produced a social state of peculiar complication, and presenting some very alarming characteristics. The sudden development of the manufacturing system, that leading concentration of monied power, gave, as its first collateral product, a fresh efflorescence to the representatives of the feudal power. The feudal class has been fed by the monied class, but only, to all appearance, to be ultimately devoured by it. The feudal chiefs, through a monopoly of the land, and the monied chiefs, through a monopoly of capital, concentrated and fenced by the credit system, have both been pressing on the labouring masses, but they could never have crushed so large a portion of these masses so, had they not been exposed to a worse enemy than either—their own improvidence. It is through the tyranny of sensuous tastes and sensual propensities that so many of them have been reduced to worse than serfdom again—into a hand-to-mouth life, entailing perpetual competition for work—doomed, through the operation of social laws more stable than the everlasting hills, to ever-increasing toil, only to realise an ever-diminishing reward. What can regenerate such a social state? In the case of the thoroughly crushed and degraded sections—apparently nothing. Extinction, by one process or another, seems their inevitable doom. A startling exemplification of this we have in Ireland; but a process of the same kind, though

though more silent, slow, and inappreciable, is constantly going on in the crowded courts and alleys of every large town. The class is fed from above, and it, alas! is permanent, but race after race is constantly dying out. Amongst these degraded masses the efforts of benevolence may succeed in rescuing one here and there, but labour towards regenerating the great body, unless the supplies could be intercepted, is altogether a hopeless task; it is like emptying a ship by the pumps whilst she is leaking from stem to stern. The extent to which debasing habits prevail amongst our industrial population, who were wont to be deemed the sinews of our national strength, is fearful to think of.^b But there is a portion of our industrial population scattered through all its classes not yet crushed or debased—a portion characterized by religion, intelligence, self-control, and forethought. On them, on their moral standing, and on the eventual sufficiency of their numbers, must rest the final hopes of the community against social dissolution. Such a body of true MEN, trained to industry and economy, with the moral sentiments supreme, and animal appetites and sensuous tastes subordinate, would eventually conquer all adverse conditions. All embodiments and forms of injustice, rooted however deep in class-selfishness, and fenced by whatever hoary prescriptions and venerable associations, would yield to the silent but sublime march of its invincible energy. In virtue of the Eternal Constitutions, its numbers would go on increasing, whilst the inert and sensual classes, whether their station was found above or below, would melt and die away, till the earth should present a clear field for a reign of justice to begin.

Such a class of men—pious, industrious, temperate, unselfish, are the great want of the time. Can we wonder that their numbers are so few, when the great aim of all our exertions has been to produce *wealth*, not *men*; when we have forgotten, or reck not, so *gain* can be secured, that ‘whatever sacrifices the workman to the work—the man who produces the wealth to the wealth produced—is a monstrous system of misdirected intention, based on a blasphemy against man’s spiritual nature.’—p. 241.

Against a system in conception so grovelling, and exerting so malign an influence on the most sacred interests of mankind, most thoroughly can we adopt the just, eloquent, and indignant protest of our author:—

^b At the late meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, held in Edinburgh in August last, a paper was read by Mr. Porter, in which, by careful statistics and calculations, he showed that upwards of 57,000,000*l.* sterling are annually spent, and chiefly by our industrial population, on spirits, beer, and tobacco!

‘Whatever

‘Whatever tends to *debase man*, to make him physically, intellectually, or morally a lower being, is *bad*, however much or however little the wealth produced may be. The wealth is not the stable element—it is an accidental, and by no means the most important adjunct. *Man* is the stable element; *his* condition is the standard; *his* improvement is a good; *his* deterioration an evil—and this, independently of all other considerations. All other considerations are secondary, dependent, subsidiary to the great intention. *Man* is not useful as he produces wealth, but wealth is useful as it sustains man, ameliorates his condition, improves his capacities, gives opportunities for his further cultivation, and aids his progress in the great scheme of human regeneration.’—pp. 242, 243.

In now drawing this disquisition to a close, we may resumptively indicate our progressive conclusions. On inquiring into the natural probability of a reign of justice, by means of the evolution of a science of justice, we have found that a deductive science of justice, as the result of the ordination of all the antecedent sciences in their logical succession, is a hopeless anticipation: *first*, from the limited powers of the human mind, as against the complication of the elements with which it has to deal; and *secondly*, from the nature of the subject-matter of those sciences which have yet to be reduced to ordination—these embracing the whole domain of organized life. Where the absolute reign of number, weight, and measure terminates, uniform determinate products are succeeded by specific mean products, combining unity of *kind* with endless variety in the individual within the limits of that unity. To be able, for example, deductively to determine what must produce any given individual of the species *man* seems in the nature of the case impossible, when every man that shall ever be born into the world will *be* an individual—that is, will differ indefinitely from every other that has been—and when no conceivable number can exhaust the possibilities of yet new individualities.

We next inquired into the possibility of the evolution of an ordained or deductive science of justice *by itself*, out of universal fundamental principles alleged to exist by our author; and we found the fundamental principles of justice to be, not matter of pure intellection, but (subjectively) the combined product of the intellectual and moral emotions; being felt, not merely as *true*, but as *imperative*, demanding not only *credence* but *obedience*. And as the principles of justice were thus recognized as principles of *action*, we found a reign of justice to be possible only through a purification of the springs of action, and that this can be effected only through the reception of moral truth, recognized in the conscience as carrying with it *obligation*. That a reign of equity presupposes the antecedent evolution of the personal
and

and private virtues (and that not on a basis of interest or selfishness, but from a conviction of duty), ere the mind can be so freed from the disturbing influence of self-partiality and passion, as to make a clear and comprehensive realization of justice possible. And, finally, that the clearest perceptions of equity (supposing such in the case were possible) could not stand their ground against undisciplined sensual appetites, ungoverned passions, and a consolidated selfishness.

On the whole, then, we conclude that while no kind of truth is without its influence, and no discovery without its bearing on the progress of humanity, a reign of justice is to be mainly secured, not through the ordination of science, but of character. That the heralds of human progress are not so much the discoverers of scientific truth as of moral wisdom—wisdom that can apprehend and apply the principles of action vital to the time—men who can plant themselves ahead to catch and reflect the moral light, essential to the safe conduct of the community, through each progressive crisis of the social march. By the adequate realization and faithful discharge of their appropriate function, hangs the moral evolution of civilization in every community. It is like the spirit of the living creatures and the wheels, in the Prophet's vision: 'When those went, these went; and when those stood, these stood.' Only by the continuous and fresh infusion of their appropriate convictions, can society be saved from moral stagnation, retrogression, and infinite resultant misery.

In taking leave, for the present, of the author of '*Human Progression*,' we do so with feelings of very special respect and gratitude. Almost in proportion as we have had to differ from him in his theory, do we agree with him in his main practical conclusions. He has, indeed, as we conceive, been led astray by a too wide and imposing generalization; and the method of inquiry thereby induced, combined with a sanguine temperament, has given a certain dogmatic peremptoriness, and even acerbity to some of the more practical portions of his disquisition, and swept him on too hastily, unheeding of qualifying circumstances, and the peculiar character of social action, towards some of his conclusions. But his instinct of justice is of such special keenness and strength, that it generally triumphs over all these infelicities, conducting him in the main to sound practical conclusions; and bringing the intense light of moral intuitions to bear on every form of legal injustice and social wrong.

It has been matter of regret, that in the line of criticism we have felt it necessary to pursue, no opportunities have presented themselves of giving any example to the reader of the felicity with which, by one or two strokes of power, he can place objects

too often confounded in a flood of distinctive light. Bare justice demands that we should cite one or two such, and they shall be the following, which stand side by side:—

‘ Politics, taking into consideration only the relations of *men*, cannot take cognizance of any duty which would still be a duty if only one man were in existence. The duties of religion that relate to the Creator are beyond and above the sphere of politics; and so also are the duties of benevolence, which belong to another category than equity.

‘ It is only as men may act towards each other *equitably* or *unequitably*, that we consider their relations. An act of benevolence is not, strictly speaking, either equitable or unequitable. The recipient has no equitable claim to the bounty; and what the donor gives, he gives not to satisfy the law of equity, but a higher law, which applies to him as an individual, but which it is impossible to apply (by law and force) to a society. The relations of men must first be constructed on the principle of equity, and then each individual may exercise his benevolence as occasion may require. Were there no equity there could be no benevolence, because no man could know what was his *own*, or what he had *a right to give*.’—pp. 30, 31.

W. M.

LETTER AND SPIRIT IN THE OLD TESTAMENT SCRIPTURES.*

In our former article we endeavoured to ascertain the laws which govern the *letter* of the Old Testament, and the relation in which it stands to the *spirit* of the New Testament.

I. Three leading characters were assigned to the Old Testament *letter*:—

1. Its uniformly representing, by mere *fleshly* means, a *spiritual* reality.

2. Its *specific and certain*, and generally natural and essential, resemblance to the spiritual thing which it represents.

3. Its possession of *an immediate relation to God*, analogous to that of its spirit or antitype.

The Old Testament letter was examined under two departments—that of *type*, representing *future*; and that of *type-symbol*, representing *present* spiritual things. In both these departments it was distinguished from two other subjects of Old Testament Scripture, with which it is liable to be confounded:—

* This is to be taken as a sequel to the former article under the same title in No. XI. of the Journal of Sacred Literature.

1. From

1. From the mere *symbol*, which—

(i.), earthly in its nature like the type and type-symbol, often, in contradistinction to these, represents a subject of *the same earthly nature* with itself—

(ii.), is often *constructed arbitrarily*, possessing no certain or essential resemblance to the thing which it represents—

(iii.), *does not stand*, like the type and type-symbol, in an *immediate relation to God*, and does not, like these, form part of a system of religion destitute of meaning or purpose; as we saw, when viewed apart from God as its centre of authority and sole object of worship.

2. From the spiritual reality, which the Apostle designates in Heb. x. 1, '*the very image*,' and as such contrasts with the fleshly shadows of the law. This is Christ himself, or the real spiritual likeness of Christ, the great subject of these shadowy representations. Such a likeness is, of course, a thing impossible, if we understand by it a copy of those excellences which belong to Christ personally as the Son of God, as his mediatorial glory and righteousness, and the efficacy of his sacrifice for sin; but it is, nevertheless, realized in a lower sense in the history and character of all who, 'beholding as in a glass,' either through the Old Testament veil, or 'with open face' subsequently to its removal, 'the glory of the Lord, are changed into *the same image* from glory to glory as by the Spirit of the Lord.'

II. The *spirit* of the Old Testament Scriptures is simply the spiritual reality represented by the Old Testament letter. It divides itself under two heads, corresponding to—

1. The type. The great antitype of the Old Testament types is *Christ*, in the various aspects of his character as a Saviour, and the various features and applications of his work for sinners, including the results of his work in *the character and destiny of his people*. To this is to be added *the spiritual evils and enemies* which Christ's work is designed to overcome, the representation of which, it appeared, was necessary to give that system meaning as a shadow of the great salvation *from sin*.

2. The type-symbol. The spirit or antitype of the type-symbol is to be found in those *spiritual realities present contemporaneously with it under the Old Testament*. Such are the spiritual services of believing Old Testament worshippers, aptly represented by the external services of the law. Its grand distinguishing subject of representation, however, appeared to be *the present imperfection of a dispensation of letter or law*; the bondage to which it subjects the legal worshippers; the distance from God at which it keeps them; its inability to give peace and joy; to confer permanent forgiveness or effectual purification; its infliction of

the curse of God for transgression, and of death as the result of that curse.

The 'image,' then, as above described, it will be seen, belongs to the department, not of 'letter,' but of 'spirit.' As existing in the Old Testament, it only forms an anticipation of the New Testament antitype or spiritual reality; it is the presence of a Divine and saving influence derived from Christ, ere yet he had appeared to offer the necessary sacrifice for sin, or had either been himself perfected by his death, or had given the destined perfection to his people (see Heb. xi. 40). It is a real, though imperfectly developed, spiritual likeness of Christ, his blood-bought privileges, his Divine character and glory; and it constantly presents itself in the history of Old Testament believers, in connection with the earthly shadows amid which they lived, and the multiplied carnal ordinances whose yoke they were called to bear. The skill of an Old Testament interpreter greatly depends on his ability to distinguish this spiritual reality from the 'letter,' with which in the narrative it is constantly mixed up.

The narrative of Joseph may be taken as an illustration of the threefold aspect of 'letter,' 'spirit,' and 'image,' under which most Old Testament narratives are to be viewed. 1. The letter or earthly type, in the circumstances of Joseph's history, in so far as they were merely outward or natural. 2. The spiritual antitype, in the character and history of Jesus Christ, not directly present in the story, but only represented through the medium of Joseph's history—his trials, and deliverance, and exaltation, and the compassionate exercise of his power for the relief of his famishing brethren. 3. The image or present spiritual reality, consisting in Joseph's character and history, viewed as a believing and spiritual man.

Joseph's rejection by his brethren on account of the favour shown him by his father and by God, his humiliation and seeming death, his advancement to a situation of power by the very means employed to ruin him, his using that power to save the lives of his enemies or murderers,—all constitute an earthly figure of the history of Christ, the true 'Shepherd and Stone of Israel,' which has generally forced itself on the notice of spiritual interpreters of the Bible story. These circumstances, which all occurred in a mere earthly sphere, and which might have been realized without the presence of any spiritual element in the story, form the Old Testament letter or type. We have next to contemplate the great reality which these things represent, accomplished in the history of Jesus Christ in his humiliation and death, through the agency of his brethren the Jews; in his exaltation, through the means of his death, on a heavenly throne; and in the mercy which

which he began to extend, on the day of Pentecost, to his 'betrayers and murderers.' Here we have a history corresponding throughout, yet it is a mere correspondence of outline. The subject of which it treats is different and opposite as heaven differs from earth—as spirit from flesh. Part of its scene is laid on earth, like Joseph's typical history; but, unlike it, its crisis stands connected with both worlds, and its issues are seen stretching into eternity.

But there is another view of Joseph's history in which he is presented to us, not as a shadow, but as an 'image' of Jesus Christ. Joseph was a spiritual man. Enough appears to show us that he was hated by his brethren, not only for 'his coat of many colours' and his dreams, but because their works were evil, while their brother's were righteous. 'Joseph brought unto his father their evil report.' In this view, as under his typical character, Joseph represents Christ, but it is in respect to different features in the story, and in a different sphere. As a type of Christ, Joseph lived and acted in an earthly, as an image in a spiritual sphere. Besides, instead of presenting a complete outline of Christ's history as in his typical character, Joseph's life on earth, as an image, represented it only to a limited extent. His earthly history in a spiritual view, notwithstanding his ultimate prosperity and elevation, must be throughout regarded, like that of Christ and all Christ's followers, the period of his humiliation and suffering; and under this aspect, his exaltation only began where Christ's began, and where his history in the Book of Genesis ends, on his passing from the trials and shadowy honours of earth to the glories of the heavenly state.

The same distinctions are to be applied to the history of David. We have, first, his mere earthly history, comprising a period of unmerited humiliation and suffering, and a subsequent triumph and exaltation. Second, the history of his antitype Jesus Christ, anointed by God, yet unrecognized by the world, and for a season not installed in his royal dignity, afterwards exalted to reign over a willing people and an extended dominion. Third, David's history as a believer and a saint, as it is portrayed in the narrative, and especially in his Psalms; presenting his life throughout as one of conflict, and suffering, and persecution for righteousness sake, corresponding to the period of Christ's humiliation upon earth.

Perhaps the most important application of these distinctions is to be found in the history of Abraham, and in the privileges conferred on him, and two distinct classes considered, in different senses, as his family or descendants.

First.

First. We have Abraham's history as it might have been realized in the absence of the eminent spiritual qualities, by which, through grace, that patriarch was distinguished; his leaving, in obedience to a Divine command, the land of his nativity; his dwelling as a pilgrim and stranger in the land of Canaan; the miraculous birth to him of a son in his old age; the multiplication of his posterity; their deliverance from bondage in Egypt; their conquest of Canaan, and settlement there. These are features in the history of Abraham and his family, not only capable of being contemplated apart from the spiritual character of himself or any of his posterity, but in most respects contrary to the usual course of God's providence towards his saved people, as it appears in New Testament times separated from the earthly peculiarities of the typical system.

Second. We have presented to us, through the medium of this earthly story, the history of Abraham's antitype, Jesus Christ; his obedience to his Father, as evinced in a life of holy separation from the world; God's raising up to him, by the immediate exercise of his omnipotence, a numerous spiritual seed, interested in the promises given to himself as a Covenant Head; their life of pilgrimage in the world in fellowship with himself; their victory over their spiritual enemies, and their ultimate establishment in the heavenly Canaan.

Third. We have directly presented to us in the narrative Abraham's history as a believer in the promise of a spiritual Redeemer, his faith sustaining him in a course of uniform and implicit obedience in the face of *extreme* obstacles and discouragements—his absolute renunciation of earthly benefits and helps as the ground of his dependence. In connection with this, we have God's engagement that he should be the progenitor of the promised Messiah, according to the flesh; and that thus he should be the father of an innumerable multitude of saved souls, partly springing from his own body, and partly added to his believing natural posterity from the other nations of the earth. We have here an element of a fleshly nature in Abraham's spiritual privileges, indissolubly associated with his faith and holy obedience; namely, his fleshly progenitorship of Messiah, and his consequent paternal relation to all the believing followers of Christ; but it *arises out of* his purely spiritual distinctions, and does not originate or determine them, and hence, we shall see, does not affect the security of the place which these privileges give to him in the kingdom of God.

It is evident that, as Aaron and his posterity, representing in a mere fleshly way Jesus Christ and his people, in respect of the priestly function of coming near to God, constituted a type of the true

true priesthood of the New Covenant, without any necessary interest in the same reality on the part at least of Aaron's descendants, and without any paternal relation to Jesus Christ and his people on the part of Aaron himself, such as Abraham sustained, so Abraham might have constituted an earthly type of Jesus Christ, as a Covenant Head, although he and his posterity had possessed none of those personal relations to Jesus Christ, and the spiritual privileges of his kingdom, by which he and his posterity were distinguished. But it was the appointment of God that Abraham, being an eminent pattern of a believing and saved man, should be the fleshly progenitor of the Great Author of salvation, and also of a numerous posterity, to share with himself in the blessings of saving grace, besides being constituted, through this paternal relation to Christ, the Father of an innumerable multitude of believers out of every nation and kindred, made one with him in Christ.

The former two aspects of Abraham's position in the scheme of Divine Revelation, to the exclusion of the last, may be presented in the following tabular form:—

LETTER.

1. Abraham is separated from his country and kindred by the command of God.

2. Abraham is miraculously made the progenitor of a numerous posterity when his own body and Sarah's womb are as good as dead.

3. Abraham, as a Covenant Head, receives great earthly promises on behalf of his natural posterity.

4. Abraham and his natural posterity live as strangers in the earthly Canaan, waiting for the fulfilment of the Divine promise that they should inherit the land, having God dwelling in it as their God.

5. Abraham's posterity ultimately overcome their enemies and are triumphantly settled in the promised land.

SPIRIT.

1. Jesus Christ is holy * * * separate from sinners.

2. Jesus Christ is raised from the dead, and becomes the Author of eternal life to a numerous spiritual seed, previously dead under the curse for sin.

3. Jesus Christ, as a Covenant Head, receives great spiritual promises on behalf of his spiritual seed.

4. Jesus Christ and his spiritual seed live as strangers in the world, waiting for the promise of a Heavenly inheritance with God.

5. Christ's spiritual seed, after sojourning in this world and encountering many enemies, ultimately overcome all their enemies, and are established in their promised inheritance.

Under another scheme we might begin with the deliverance of Abraham's posterity from Egyptian bondage, according to God's promise

promise to Abraham and for Abraham's sake, and show the representation which the history from this point furnishes of the history of the true salvation of the spiritual seed. 1st. In their redemption from sin's bondage through death, figured in Israel's passing through the Red Sea, a shadow of the death of believers in the death of Christ (comp. 1 Cor. x. 1, 2, and Rom. vi. 3, 4). 2nd. In the Divine teaching of the Church, which began after Christ's exaltation on the day of Pentecost, figured in the external teaching of the fleshly Israel from Mount Sinai, fifty days after their redemption from Egypt (see 2 Cor. iii. 3). 3rd. In their pilgrimage and temptations in the world, figured by Israel's wanderings and trials in the wilderness. 4th. In their entering Heaven through the medium of death, under the protection of their priestly forerunner, figured by Israel entering Canaan through the divided waters of Jordan, under the protection of the Aaronic priests. 5th. In their ultimate peaceful establishment in the heavenly kingdom, figured, as under the former scheme, by Israel's triumphant settlement in Canaan.

The place occupied by Abraham as a typical Covenant Head, as exhibited in the foregoing parallels, is not formally explained in the New Testament. Even the Covenant Headship of Jesus Christ, which Abraham's typical relation to his posterity represents, is no where made the subject of formal definition. But it is constantly supposed and reasoned upon, as a first principle in revealed truth; and the pervading presence of the same principle of Covenant Headship in the letter of the Old Testament, in connection with the great heads of Old Testament families, as Adam, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, Aaron, and finally David, is occasionally referred to as an illustration of the New Testament reality, full of instruction to those who have studied closely the Scriptural history (see 1 Cor. xv. 22, 23; Rom. ix. 4 compared with 7; Gal. iv. 22-26). Having gathered from a comparison of the Old and New Testament Scriptures the relation in which believers stand to Jesus Christ as his spiritual seed, deriving from him their spiritual life, and entitled to claim an interest in the promises given to him as their Covenant Head, we are enabled to read the records of the operation of this principle in the Old Testament letter as a continued exhibition of the mystery of salvation through the believer's union to Christ as his Spiritual Progenitor and Covenant Head. With this key in our hand we can derive from a large class of Old Testament passages, the mere letter of which sheds no proper light on our privileges and hopes, assuring declarations of the unchangeable grace of God secured to us in Christ. Such passages as—'I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob'—a
formula,

formula, it will be observed, used only in reference to these common progenitors of the Israelitish family, the original recipients of the promises on behalf of their posterity, and never applied to subsequent worthies, however eminent, now becomes a declaration of the Covenant relation of God, the Father, to Jesus Christ, as the Head and Surety of his believing people; and by an easy and necessary transference, opens up in the Old Testament history a continued illustration of the corresponding New Testament description of the God of grace as 'the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.'

The third, or spiritual aspect of Abraham's history and privileges, not included in the foregoing scheme, presents to us a subject entirely distinct, and introduces us to very important principles in the kingdom of God, which can only be clearly understood by a recognition of the separate sphere in which their operation appears.

The place occupied by Abraham in the scheme of the Divine dispensations is the frequent ground of argument adopted by the New Testament writers in the establishment of fundamental Gospel doctrines, and this not merely in the way of illustration or analogy, but as *directly determining* the nature of the New Covenant and the privileges of its children. This indicates the existence of a great spiritual reality in Abraham's connection with the kingdom of God, not falling under the description either of type, which is merely an earthly thing, nor under that of antitype, which, relatively to Abraham, is realized only in the Covenant Headship of Jesus Christ, but belonging to the third department of 'image,' or real spiritual likeness of Christ as its principle is common to the Old and the New Testament Scriptures.

Under this head, Abraham is presented to us, first, as the instrument of bringing forth the promised salvation of the Church, being constituted the fleshly progenitor of Messiah himself, in whom all the nations of the earth should be blessed.

Second, as the instrument of producing a numerous progeny of elect and saved souls, being the father of a race, in the line of Isaac and Jacob, to whom, as to Abraham himself, and on the same principle of free grace, the Lord promised to be 'a God,' a promise involving spiritual life and eternal salvation (see Matt. xxii. 32; compare Heb. xi. 16), fulfilled in the constant succession of a believing remnant among his natural posterity downward to the coming of Christ, and whom he especially engaged to make the subjects of New Covenant grace in the latter days (see Jer. xxxi. 31-37; compare Acts iii. 25, 26).

Third, as the Father of all believers gathered from the Gentile nations, who become partakers of the grace of the New Covenant

Covenant by being grafted into 'the good olive-tree' of the Abrahamic family, with whom the New Covenant is primarily made (see Rom. xi. ; Gal. iii. 6, 7, 27-29 ; Ephes. ii. 11-19 ; compare Heb. viii. 7-12).

Thus the history of Abraham presents to us two distinct Covenants on which the spiritual privileges of the saved Church, under different aspects, rest. First. The Covenant of Grace, peculiarly so called in our systems of theology, of which Christ, the antitype of Abraham, is the Covenant Head ; of which Abraham himself is properly one of the children, and by which the salvation of all believers, as alike the spiritual seed of the Saviour, is secured. Second. The Covenant of spiritual blessings established with Abraham and the Abrahamic family, securing to an elect remnant in that family, throughout their generations, the grace of eternal salvation, ultimately developed in the New Covenant of Gospel times. Under this second aspect of the plan of mercy, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are not children of the Covenant, but 'Fathers' and Covenant Heads ; and Christ, with his brethren the people of Israel primarily, and then all believers, as the children of Abraham by faith, are 'the seed.' While, under the former view, faith is the only ground of distinction recognized by the Covenant, procuring for all who have grace to believe in the appointed remedy, an essential equality of privilege as children of God in God's house ; under the latter view, saving blessings are directed 'first' to 'the house of Israel and the house of Judah ;' the New Covenant is established with an elect remnant of this family, representing the whole, to whom Gentile believers are joined ; and the unbelieving part of the race, being preserved through a lengthened period of calamity, as 'beloved for the fathers' sakes,' are destined to be 'all' saved, and made the channels of Gospel blessings to the other nations of the earth.

The Covenant made with Abraham, as it secured redemption from Egypt and the possession of Canaan to the whole fleshly race of Israel, was a mere earthly representation of the Covenant of grace, a mere 'letter' or type of which Christ and his spiritual seed, and the spiritual salvation which they obtain through their relation to Christ, form the spirit or antitype. It accordingly issues, at least while meantime disconnected with the spiritual reality which it represents, as all mere fleshly things necessarily issue, in failure, disappointment, and death. But the Covenant with Abraham, viewed as securing great spiritual benefits to the Abrahamic family, is a spiritual reality, not a type. It does not vanish away like the shadows of the law, but is still, and will ever continue to be, in force, undertaking for the salvation of multitudes of Abraham's natural posterity and of Gentiles joined to them by faith,
and

and determining the principles on which the redeemed, throughout all ages, become partakers of eternal life. This Covenant does indeed recognize a fleshly element, in the priority of privilege which it assigns to the children of Abraham by natural descent. But the mere presence of an earthly element does not constitute any blessing an earthly thing, in the sense of separating it from the dispensation of saving grace. Otherwise, the incarnation of Christ, his union to his people, the apostolic office and authority in the Church, the administration of New Testament privileges, and the consummation of the believer's salvation in the resurrection of his body, would all be earthly and not spiritual things. It is only necessary that the earthly element be subordinated to the exercise and manifestation of God's sovereign grace. The Covenant with Abraham, spiritually viewed, gave no paramount place to fleshly descent, or any other fleshly distinction or influence in the kingdom of God. The hereditary privileges of Abraham's posterity secured to no individual Israelite a proper interest in God's favour, or a true or permanent standing in God's house. The children, of the flesh, these are not the children of God. They were, indeed, all dignified, under the shadowy provisions of the typical Covenant, as God's 'holy nation' and 'peculiar people,' to whom pertained '*the adoption and the glory.*' But on the revelation of the better sonship through a new and heavenly birth, this hereditary and shadowy privilege was done away. 'Begin not to say within yourselves, we have Abraham to our Father; for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham.'—'Cast out the bondwoman and her son, for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the free woman,' applied by the Apostle to the appointed ejection of the carnal Israel from the New Testament Church (see Gal. iv. 25, 29, 30). Under the provisions of the spiritual promise given to their Father Abraham they are still, *as a race*, the objects of Covenant love; but here the fleshly element is absolutely subservient to the actings of God's sovereign grace, which is engaged to deal savingly with the posterity of Abraham only as with the posterity of Adam himself, in those instances and in those measures which his own good pleasure and boundless wisdom shall appoint.

The Covenant made with believing Abraham, then, on behalf of his spiritual seed, is properly an image, not a type, of the New Testament reality. It is only a special application, its influence extending through all subsequent time, of that great law in the kingdom of grace by which God makes fleshly instrumentalities and relations the means of diffusing, *according to his own sovereign pleasure*, the blessing of salvation.

There

There are three great practical uses to which the foregoing distinctions are to be applied, especially the grand distinction between the letter on the one hand, and, on the other hand, its spirit or antitype in the New Testament, which is Christ, with his 'image,' or the spiritual reality derived from him through grace, whether in Old or New Testament times.

I. Their first use is in the interpretation and application of Old Testament Scripture. Keeping in view the three distinctive features assigned to the Old Testament 'letter,' we shall be directed, throughout its diversified representations, to Him to whom Moses in the Law, and the Prophets, and the Psalms, all give witness; and in dealing with individual types we shall be guided, apart from the suggestions of fancy, to the precise spiritual realities to which they are designed to point. Let us mark how our definitions contribute to the right use of the Old Testament.

(1.) 'The type and type-symbol are earthly things, representing spiritual things.'

Having been enabled to recognize these two departments of Old Testament letter by the two other definitions, of which we are in the sequel to show the use, we shall be led by the present definition, in studying them, to contemplate the higher things which they represent; and in dealing with things of earth, in the reading of the Old Testament, we shall be brought into converse with great spiritual realities, equally interesting to us as to ancient Israel, existing within the veil.

Again, we shall be kept from being stumbled by the gross faults of eminent Old Testament characters, such as Noah, Aaron, Jethro, Samson, and others. The Old Testament representation of the New Testament reality is designed to illustrate the latter as much by a relation of contrast as of correspondence. The fleshly representations of the law are systematically associated with an exhibition of the imperfection, and emptiness, and evanescence which belongs to all fleshly things in themselves, for the very purpose of shutting us up to God, and the grace of God in his Son Jesus Christ, made manifest in the New Testament. On the same principle we shall be preserved from the fatal error of using the imperfect provisions of Old Testament law, as in regard to marriage, the sanction of private revenge, the use of vows, &c., as an authority, or Old Testament example as a precedent for New Testament religion. The adoption, in a greater or less degree, of the fleshly principles of the Old Testament dispensation has, it may be feared, marred the purity and impaired the power of all our ecclesiastical systems, and is the very root and strength of that mighty structure of superstition and spiritual tyranny now rising before our eyes in England.

Finally,

Finally, the Old Testament type having now been fulfilled and illustrated to us in the New Testament reality, we shall be enabled, by carrying back to it the clear light of an unveiled Gospel, to decipher the otherwise dark and uncertain representations of the law. Thus we shall find the advantage of obeying the frequent injunctions of our Lord and his Apostles to study the Scriptures—meaning, of course, the Old Testament Scriptures—as throughout pervaded by ‘the testimony of Jesus,’ which is ‘*the spirit of prophecy*,’ and as ‘able to make us wise unto salvation *through faith, which is in Christ Jesus*.’ The New Testament writers not only teach generally the existence of a divinely-adjusted relation between the ‘letter’ of the Old Testament and its ‘spirit’ in the kingdom of God; but this relation is constantly supposed by them in their interpretation of particular Old Testament texts. Passages in which, under the guidance of our own wisdom, we should never have looked for any sense apart from the letter—such as the history of Melchisedec, the casting out of Hagar and Ishmael from Abraham’s family, and the return of Israel from Egypt—are applied in the New Testament to Jesus Christ and the affairs of his kingdom, in terms which absolutely exclude the idea of their being so applied in the way of accommodation. Strangers as we generally are to the science of analogy, between the objects which we see and the greater realities within the veil, and unfitted as we are, from our feeble apprehensions of the mystery of redemption, to detect the principles of the Divine government exhibited in it, as in endless variety of shadowy representations they lie hidden in all nature and providence, such a method of interpretation may appear to us unnatural and fanciful. But a suitable impression of the Divine wisdom by which the Apostles spake, will lead us to seek the removal of our difficulty rather in a more profound and comprehensive understanding of truth, than in the supposition that the inspired writers could possibly misrepresent the mind of God in his Word, or make it the subject of arbitrary and fanciful accommodations. As we advance in acquaintance with the Divine Word, we shall perceive more of the reasonableness of that method of interpretation employed by the Apostles, more of its Divine wisdom and harmony, and its congruity with profound adjustments and analogies pervading the constitution of the universe. We shall also be better prepared for using the same method with certainty, in dealing with passages which they have left unexplained. Our growing acquaintance with the realities of the kingdom of God will force upon our attention the principles of saving grace in Christ, as in endless variety of combinations they are represented by the earthly shadows of the Old Testament. In proportion as we are familiar with the features

features of a friend, we surely recognize the picture in which they are faithfully represented. If we find a series of drawings delineating these singly and in various combinations, separate from the entire portrait, we shall have our attention forcibly called to many beauties and imperfections which passed unnoticed before. In virtue of this principle, a great practical importance belongs to the study of the Old Testament, as a repository of wisdom in the mystery of redemption. These types are not available for proving any doctrine not otherwise revealed, as the picture cannot prove the existence of any feature or peculiarity in a supposed living original, which on comparison we are not able to verify by direct inspection. But they suggest new views of truth, while they confirm and render vivid perceptions which were previously feeble and obscure. The mystery contained in the types 'hidden from ages and generations' having now been revealed in the manifestation of Jesus Christ, we have a word of prophecy 'more sure,' whereunto we do well that we take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn and the day-star arise in our hearts.

2. 'The type and type-symbol are related to the spiritual reality which they represent, not on any arbitrary principle of representation, but by a specific and certain, and generally a natural and essential resemblance.' The use of this definition will preserve us from arbitrary and fanciful accommodations of the Old Testament letter. It is not enough that we find even a spiritual reality to which the earthly figure is capable of being accommodated, in virtue of some superficial resemblance, such as those very generally fixed on by writers on the types. The case here, in the interpretation of *material figures* of spiritual things, is entirely parallel to that of the interpretation of *written or spoken language*, composed of verbal descriptions of the same things. It is not enough that the doctrine derived from the representation be true in itself. It is necessary that it be the very truth which, according to the established laws of the mode of representation employed, whether this be emblematical or verbal, may be shown in the instance in question to have been designed to be conveyed. This illustration will, at the same time, serve to show the unsoundness of the conclusion adopted by Bishop Marsh and many other writers on Scripture interpretation, who argue against the possibility of interpreting any Scripture types which have not been expounded by the Scripture writers themselves, on the ground of our being unable to demonstrate to other minds the truth of any spiritual sense which we may have adopted as that of the author of the type. There is a certain ambiguity characterizing all human language, which leaves room for an indefinite amount of misunderstanding,

misunderstanding, especially in the interpretation of ancient writings, or those treating of subjects in themselves obscure, or to the reader previously unknown. This applies to the Scriptures above all other books; yet, by the blessing of God, on a careful and single-minded study of the sacred writings, examining texts in their scriptural connection, comparing one part with another, and every single passage with the ascertained scope of the whole revelation, they become in all their important intimations plain and sure to the most unlearned. Thus it would be found to be in the study of Old Testament types, did we once address ourselves to it on the principles which the New Testament writers have prescribed. However slow and painful the process, by keeping in view the great character and design of the typical system as a representation of good things to come, by using the inspired specimens of typical interpretation left on record in the New Testament to fix the meaning of other parallel types, and by applying ascertained expositions as a key to decipher the whole system in virtue of its divinely-framed connections; and, finally, by comparing our conclusions with the revelations of the Gospel, and the latent references to the Old Testament with which the New Testament Scriptures abound, we should constantly approximate to a sure and perfect vision of that glory which Moses temporarily covered with a veil.

3. 'The representations of the type and type-symbol stand immediately related to God, He himself being unrepresented, and their relation to God being analogous to that of the spiritual reality which they represent.' This, with, often, the preceding definition, will enable us to distinguish the letter of the Old Testament, having its fulfilment uniformly in spiritual things, from mere symbols often representing things earthly; and will guide us in looking for the spiritual reality in every case in which it is intended to be shadowed forth. It will also furnish us with important aid, as explained in our former article, in understanding, in any given case, the designed representation of the Old Testament letter. It will, besides, guard us against a frequent mistake then adverted to, of applying to *the Father*—the supreme authority in the economy of Godhead—representations intended to cast important light upon the character and offices of *Christ*; as in Abraham offering his son Isaac, and in the visible glory of the most holy place of the earthly tabernacle, the appointed figure in the Levitical economy of the *ἀπαγγελία* of Heb. i. 3:

II. The second use of the principles laid down is in directing us to the maintenance of the purity of the New Testament administration: this has already been partly anticipated. A grand peculiarity of the New Testament system is the absolute abolition which

which it enforces of the Old Testament shadows. This is largely and strongly insisted on in the apostolic epistles, especially in those to the Galatians, the Colossians, and the Hebrews: 'Let no man, therefore, judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holiday, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days, which are a *shadow of things to come*, but the *body is of Christ* * * * * Wherefore if ye be dead with Christ, from the rudiments of the world, why, as though living in the world, are ye subject to ordinances (touch not, taste not, handle not, which all are to perish with the using) after the commandments and doctrines of men?' This, with similar passages, does not merely import the change of the outward form of divine ordinances, the substitution of one earthly shadow for another; it announces the entire repeal of the *fleshly principle* of Old Testament administration, to give place to the manifestation of Christ, the antitype, and his image in his saved and regenerated Church. In our former article we stated the ground on which we are able to maintain the consistency of this change of principle with the fact of the institution of new ordinances, earthly in their outward form, usually called Sacraments in the New Testament Church. These ordinances have no independent standing or virtue in the Christian Church as the carnal ordinances of the law had, at least in their own earthly sphere, under the former dispensation. They are the mere badge of a vital union to Christ, the mere form or shape in which the New Testament Church, first made manifest in its spirituality by the operation of Divine grace, presents itself to the outward eye. Importing, as they do, by their clear Scriptural definition a recognition of a man's standing in the house of God; to assign to them such an independent place and virtue by administering them to those on whom the sovereign grace of the Spirit has not first impressed its own visible and credible marks, is plainly to corrupt the spiritual Church of the New Testament by mingling it with the abolished shadows of the law and the beggarly elements of the world—it is practically to subvert, as the Apostle has shown in the Epistle to the Galatians, the foundations of the gospel of the grace of God.

III. Finally, the correspondence which has been asserted between the earthly events and ordinances of the Old Testament and the spiritual realities of the kingdom of God, opens up a vast field of evidence for the divine origin of the scriptures, and of the plan of mercy which they reveal. The *literal* fulfilment of prophecy has, in the hands of such writers as Bishop Newton and Dr. Keith, furnished some of the most effective weapons wherewith to meet the assaults of infidelity. Yet its indications in matters of detail are very frequently uncertain; and a large part of the historical matter

matter which, as it passed in the course of providence, would have gone to verify preceding predictions, has been irrecoverably lost. But 'the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy'—and of this one ultimate theme of the representations of Old Testament predictions, and history, and law, we have a plain and ever-enduring record in the New Testament Scriptures. Here yet lies, almost untouched, an infinite mine of evidence which no devastations can destroy, and no labour can exhaust. Were we to meet with a rude tribe who asserted, on the faith of some tradition or record possessed by themselves, the existence in a remote bygone age of a nation of high civilization and wide renown, inhabiting the country now occupied by themselves; and were there suddenly to be disclosed under their soil the vast remains of great cities and monuments, and elaborate works of art; how overpowering would be the evidence of the account which these simple witnesses, unconscious of the existence of the forthcoming confirmation, had addressed to us. Such an evidence have we of the existence of the plan of redemption in the Divine mind in Old Testament times, arising from the latent but wondrous delineation of that plan which a close examination, in our day of light, discloses to us in the writings of Moses and the prophets 'who prophesied of the grace that should come unto us; to whom it was revealed, that not unto themselves but unto us they did minister the things now reported to us—searching what, or what manner of time, the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow.' Probably it will be one of the distinguished privileges of the church of the latter days—in the realizing of which converted Israel will bear an important part—to read plainly, in the light of Christ's glory, that ancient record of the purposes of God's grace which was 'written for our learning,' but which we are, even now, only painfully spelling out, through the thick and darkening medium of the Old Testament veil. Thus there will arise, from the book of Divine Revelation, a testimony to its own divinity which will at last silence the cavils of the sceptic, while from itself also there will come forth an exposition of its remaining mysteries, rendering them 'all plain,' and 'all profitable' for perfecting the man of God.^b

L. M.

^b We have been requested to indicate the following corrigenda in the previous article:—

Vol. iv. p. 10, line 19 from bottom, *for* 'type' *read* 'symbol.'

" p. 15, " 16-12 " *for* 'As under the former view . . . so in the latter view,' *read*, 'But while under the former view . . . in the latter view.'

" p. 20, " 11 from bottom, *for* 'the' *read* 'its.'

" p. 20, " 1 " *for* 'three' *read* 'then.'

" p. 23, " 4 " *for* 'creative of righteousness' *read* 'creative righteousness.'

JOHN CALVIN.

Das Leben Johann Calvin, des grossen Reformators. Von PAUL HENRY, Prediger an der Französisch-Friedrichstädtischen Kirche zu Berlin. 3 vol. 8vo. Hamburg bei Friedrich Perthes, 1835.

The Life and Times of John Calvin, the Great Reformer. Translated from the German of PAUL HENRY, D.D., by HENRY STEBBING, D.D., F.R.S. 2 vols. 8vo. Whittaker and Co., London, 1849.

The Life of John Calvin, compiled from Authentic Sources, and particularly from his Correspondence. By THOMAS H. DYER. With a Portrait. John Murray, London, 1850.

OF all the eminent men who flourished at the era of the Reformation, Calvin may perhaps, all things considered, be justly regarded as the greatest. Zuingli had the precedence of him by several years, and may be said to have anticipated him in some of his views; and Luther, in all that regards power of influencing the popular mind, fervour of spirit and genius, as well as personal intrepidity, was greatly his superior. If we remember, however, that the peculiar glory of the Reformation, as well as the source from which all the blessings that accompanied it flowed, was the *exhibition of divine truth* which then took place, and if we recognize the immense and unparalleled extent to which Calvin succeeded in this department, whether as seen in his admirably arranged and logical 'Institutes of the Christian Religion,' or in his penetrating and luminous expositions of the sacred volume, we shall scarcely hesitate to give to him the place of superiority.

But whatever view may be taken of the merits of Calvin, there is one point on which there can be no doubt, viz., that among all the Reformers he stands unrivalled for the amount of abuse and misrepresentation which have been heaped alike upon himself personally, and upon those views of divine truth which he made it the business of his life to illustrate and defend. To such an extent has this been carried, that one is involuntarily reminded of the words of our Lord, 'Blessed are ye when men shall revile you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely for my sake.' In this respect the servant has not been above his master.

Till the appearance of Dr. Henry's work, little had been done to set forth the real system, or to vindicate the character, of Calvin in the eyes of the world. Dr. Henry's work is upon the whole a very satisfactory one. The learned author has investigated

vestigated every source of information, and has carefully perused Calvin's works and letters, both those which have been given to the world and those which are still in manuscript. He is distinguished no less for the impartiality and care with which he examines documents and sifts evidence than for his thorough sympathy with Calvin's soul, as well as for his ability to understand Calvin's views. The work is not indeed perfect; it wants that happy arrangement and easy style which are indispensably necessary to render a work of such magnitude popular among English readers. It is also marked by some strange inconsistencies. For example, the author has a great desire to see the cross restored to its place, 'not only in sacred edifices, but by the roadside and on the rocky summit of the mountain, when the wanderer or the traveller, returning to his home, may greet it from afar, and breathe his prayer' (vol. i. p. 414); he is of opinion that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper should be celebrated at all times of public worship, and perhaps it ought, but certainly not for the reason which he gives, viz., 'that no religion can exist without a sacrifice' (vol. i. p. 412); he laments that the Protestant Church should have banished the memory of the saints from our belief, and speaks with favour of *prayers for the dead* (vol. i. p. 419), although in another passage he expresses himself against this practice (vol. ii. p. 8). It seems to us to be somewhat extraordinary that any one capable of expressing such sentiments should be able so thoroughly to appreciate the general views and practice of Calvin as Dr. Henry has shown himself to be. We have said that Dr. Henry is fully able, as far as intellect and general harmony of mind are concerned, to understand Calvin's views. He does not, however, in every case coincide with him, and, what is of greater consequence, he does not in every case give a perfectly correct representation of him. For example, the statement near the foot of p. 57, vol. i., 'that the promise will be fulfilled in those only who believe that it must be fulfilled in them, that is, in those who have faith,' conveys a view of saving faith apparently the same as Calvin's, but in reality essentially different from it. The faith of this sentence will, by most readers, be regarded as the enthusiast's notion or conviction (if we may call that a conviction which has no basis of objective testimony on which it rests), that he is the special object of the divine favour. Whereas saving faith, according to Calvin, is 'a firm and sure knowledge of the divine favour towards us, founded on the truth of a free promise in Christ, and revealed to our minds and sealed on our hearts by the Holy Spirit' (Inst., book iii. 7). In explanation of this definition he says, § 16, 'the principal hinge on which faith turns is this, we must not suppose that

any promises of mercy which the Lord offers us are only true out of us, and not at all in us ; we should rather make them ours by inwardly embracing them.' The faith of Dr. Henry is what believes that the promise will be fulfilled in us ; but why in us and not in others we know not. The faith of Calvin is what believes the divine promise, as it stands, to be true, and which, in the very act of believing a divine promise, made to men as sinners, to be true, necessarily believes it with a personal application. The *object* of the faith of Henry's description is one's self to be saved ; the *object* of Calvin's faith is, God making to sinners universally a gratuitous offer of salvation. The faith of Henry's description is ungrounded presumption ; the faith of Calvin is an appropriation or an acceptance of God's universal and free offer of mercy and salvation through Christ. In like manner, in regard to 'grace,' Dr. Henry, in discussing Calvin's views, and when endeavouring to account for that sense of freedom which all men have, makes a remark which is in direct opposition to one of the most prominent of Calvin's first principles ; and he makes it in such a way as to convey the impression that he understands himself to be laying down something which he and Calvin hold in common. The remark is this : ' Being born under the common influence of Christendom, we have grown up enjoying from our childhood an unfettered will, a will made free by grace ; for grace acts upon us from the first day of our life, bears us forward, and works in us without our knowing it.' There is also a series of remarks about Calvin being imbued with an Old Testament spirit, which are wholly uncalled for. Calvin's principles were drawn neither from the Old nor from the New Testament exclusively, but from the entire sacred volume. The forms under which the covenant of grace was administered in different ages were different, but, as Calvin well taught, the covenant under which the people of God lived and died was the same in all ages. Rites and ceremonies might pass away, but any principle of divine government, any rule of life, any law given to regulate men as connected with one another, socially or civilly, which at any time emanated from God, must necessarily be of lasting obligation ; and the very fact that the record of the Old Testament dispensation has been handed down along with the record of the New, as forming one sacred volume, is sufficient to show that the spirit of true religion is to be imbibed from the study neither of the one portion nor of the other exclusively, but of the two parts viewed as forming one undivided whole. The Old Testament cannot be understood or enjoyed fully except as seen in the light of the New ; neither is it possible to appreciate the New unless it be viewed as a structure reared on the basis of the

the Old. He speaks again of Calvin as 'being in his last confession more decided than ever against those who trusted to predestination rather than to that which immediately concerned their state.' Whereas Calvin never, even at the beginning, gave such views of predestination as had the slightest tendency to produce such an effect. Such an effect could only result from men looking at the mere word 'predestination,' without taking the trouble to read, far less to understand, what Calvin wrote on the subject.

The translation by Dr. Stebbing is, upon the whole, so far as we have examined, well executed. It does not improve the original as regards ease and fluency of style: the work, as translated by Dr. Stebbing, is much more of an unreadable book (if we may use the expression) to an English reader than it will be, as it stands in the original, to a German one. And there are several unpardonable mistakes. At p. 84, vol. i., we read, 'Calvin's views on *church establishments* are altogether evangelical: he regards them as standing on the same ground as bishops.' The word translated *church establishments* being *Kirchenältesten*, i. e. *presbyters*, the sentence ought to run: Calvin's views on presbyters are altogether evangelical; he regards them as standing on the same level with bishops. Again, at p. 302, we have, 'Luther had to bear much severer struggles. This was the consequence, probably, of a certain degree of darkness and high-mindedness. . . . Calvin's darkness, on the contrary, was always dissipated by the first of those with whom he had to contend, and even by the form of his church, which he established to suppress the influence of spiritual pride.' In this case the word translated *darkness* is *Dünkel*, which means *arrogance*, not *darkness*, the German word for the latter being *Dunkelheit*. With this change the sentences are changed at once. Calvin's arrogance disappeared the instant he came personally into contact with an opponent. We have noticed several mistakes of this kind throughout the volume. A very gross one occurs at p. 43, vol. i.: 'he proves his opinion simply from the exposition of certain passages of Scripture, that 'the rest in the grave can only be called eternal peace, *which even now progressively casts light upon the spirit*,'—instead of the rest in the grave (spoken of in Scripture) can only be eternal peace—a *procedure which casts light upon his own spirit*.' Instead of the nonsense which Dr. Stebbing makes Henry speak about the peace even now progressively casting light upon the spirit, the statement is, that Calvin's procedure (*Verfahren*), in proving at this early period of his career the doctrine in question (viz. the soul's existence when separated from the body), from passages of Scripture exclusively, and not from reasons drawn from

from the nature of the soul, casts light upon his own spirit, *i. e.* shows in what manner he was working his way out of the errors of popery, *viz.*, by setting out from the principle that the Scriptures are the word of God, and by carefully examining the import of the individual sayings of the Book of God.

But, notwithstanding these incidental blemishes of the translation, and a few faults on the part of the author, such as those we have pointed out, the work is an admirable and a useful one, and to a serious and patient mind an intensely interesting one. Both author and translator have laid the literary and religious world under the deepest obligations. Should Dr. Henry issue a second edition, we trust he will arrange his materials with greater skill, and that he will leave out much of the irrelevant matter over which the reader finds it so difficult to travel. Were his materials rightly used, a volume of intense interest, as well as of great practical utility, might be produced; and we trust that Dr. Stebbing will not only correct those errors which are the fruit of haste and of want of due revision, but will also give to the English public those appendices of Henry which form to the student perhaps the most important and interesting portion of the original work.

The arrangement which Dr. Henry has adopted, though it singles out the great leading features of Calvin's history, is not a happy one for a successful biography. It is this arrangement, we believe, that has given to his work its character of heaviness. We would venture to suggest that he would have gained the object at which he aims by this arrangement, while he might have avoided much of the lumbrous character which spoils the usefulness of his work, had he first given us a rapid and vivid historical sketch of the salient points of Calvin's history, and afterwards woven his remarks into a historical treatise, divided into three parts, corresponding to those into which he has divided his present work. 'Three main acts,' says Dr. Henry, 'are clearly discernible in his career; three fundamental ideas or conflicts, which the Spirit of God made it his duty to pursue, and which were so closely connected, that the one could not but follow as a consequence from the other. 1. In the first part of his life he won the victory for his faith, which ever remained the same; but is seen at its highest culminating point in the second edition of the *Institutes*. 2. This form of faith taught him to endeavour to frame such a government and form of discipline for the Church, as might secure its life—its holy evangelical life, and plant it permanently in the community. Hence his Presbyterian form of church rule, and the system of discipline which reached its height in the institution of a moral tribunal, and in the practice of excommunication.

communication. 3. But to secure its faith and discipline, the unity of the Church itself, and the objects of the Reformation, must be protected. Hence the severe conflict which Calvin carried on against such false teachers as Castellio, and Westphal, and others. This conflict reached its height in the proceedings against Servetus. The fundamental idea of the unity of the Church wrought upon him till the last moment of his life, and he commended it to his brethren with his dying breath.' The division here announced, is one in admirable keeping with the facts of the history. The truth of God as set forth in the Scriptures, in opposition to the lies of Satan as set forth in the Popish Church, was the great object for which Calvin lived. Having found it in early life, he practically esteemed it as a pearl of great price. He first set it forth before the eyes of his fellow-men; in brief in his Institutes, and at length in his commentaries. He next sought to ascertain, from the Word of God, the system of organization which should appear to be most distinctly stamped with the divine approbation; and having satisfied himself that he had found such a system, he strained every nerve to get it established on a firm and permanent basis. The truth, moreover, of the Word of God was frequently impugned by subtle reasoners and daring blasphemers; and hence Calvin found, as the Church had found before him at all its brightest eras, that his vocation lay not only in setting forth the naked truth, but in setting it forth in opposition to antagonist errors.

There are many of the scenes depicted by Henry, in connection with each of these topics, fraught with most thrilling interest. His view of Calvin's Institutes, and of what are commonly reckoned his peculiar doctrines, is distinguished for great merit. The synopsis is, upon the whole, good; and several of the observations made in illustration or defence of Calvin's doctrines are characterized by a spirit of sound philosophy. The most prominent and striking of his views are those on the subject of God. 'The personal God,' says Henry, 'was all to him; he referred everything to this. . . . Man was nothing; whatever of good he possesses, it comes from grace. It was not the compulsory belief in one person of the Godhead; not the violent passage of the soul through one door, to a one-sided belief adopted as the only thing necessary; not God as revealed in the New Testament only, and whom some mystics represent as comprehended merely by the mind or the feelings; not the God who, united with nature, reveals himself by degrees to our consciences (consciousness); but the ETERNAL GOD whom Moses and the Prophets knew. This was the God whom Calvin proclaimed with overpowering energy; this was the foundation of his piety.' Henry speaks of Calvin and
Augustine

Augustine as being the most nearly related of all theologians, by their deep-felt faith in God, their sense of the unity of God, and of his manifestations through the Son, and by their main doctrines, which were always closely entwined with the inner life, predestination, election of grace, salvation through grace, original sin, and the death of man's spiritual pride. These main doctrines have often been spoken of as if they were something like the fatalism of Spinoza, or of the Mussulmans. If any one, however, will take the trouble to view these as they are propounded calmly and temperately in the Institutes, and will examine the arguments from Scripture and from reason which are there brought forward in their defence, he will, we are persuaded, very soon feel satisfied that it is a much easier task to misrepresent or to malign them, than to refute them in a way that will prove satisfactory to his own mind. 'In the present day,' says Henry, 'men have set God aside by their speculations, and placed man in his stead as absolutely necessary to the eternal universe, and not as created by grace. All means have been tried to construct systems of belief; at one time they have been derived from religious feeling, at another from some favourite idea, and at other times from a sensation of dependence on an unknown infinite something which is called God.' Calvin set out with a devout sense of the personal God. Having laid down this principle, he next establishes the authority of Scripture; and it is on Scripture interpreted precisely in the same way in which we deal with any ancient author, when our object is to ascertain what was the exact idea which that author meant to convey by the words which he wrote, that Calvin builds his whole system. What is the meaning of the language of Scripture was his grand inquiry; and to the truth of God, as thus ascertained, he did full homage. Intellect in its highest and purest state, is, indeed, needed to grasp the ideas intended to be communicated by the inspired writers; and for power and grasp of sanctified intellect, as applied to the comprehension and elucidation of divine truth, Calvin stands pre-eminently distinguished. 'However terrible,' says Henry, 'the system may appear, no less grand is it in the eyes of every one who penetrates it with a feeling of the greatness of God and with faith.' And again, 'Like Dante's, Calvin's sublime spirit delighted in fixing its steady gaze on the eternal justice of God, and plunged without fear into the abyss of the righteousness of the Judge, knowing that the Redeemer liveth. Through that daring and inflexible severity, with which he seems to take everything from man, he has mainly excited against him the hostility of those who are unable to comprehend the workings of his mighty spirit.' Calvin's Institutes give a concentrated and logical view of his system.

system. His commentaries, however, will always form that portion of his writings which will be most generally read, and will be found by most readers to possess most of power to interest as well as to edify. Considering the age when they were written, they are, indeed, most wonderful productions. The well-known opinions in regard to them of Bishop Horsley, the editorial labours of Tholuck of Germany, and lastly, the well-executed translations of the Calvin Society, have done much to bring them into notice. Tholuck, in speaking of the commentary on the Epistles to the Romans, says that in it are united a pure Latin style, a thorough grammatico-historic exposition, deep thought, and living Christianity.

The concluding chapters of the first part of Dr. Henry's work contain some beautiful illustrations of those softer graces, as well as of that stern principle and self-denial, which marked Calvin's private life. His friendship for Melancthon, considering the striking difference between the two as to mental character, was indeed most wonderful ; and indicates in both, though under very different forms, the true spirit of Christ. When writing on a subject on which they were not thoroughly at one, Calvin says, 'Would to God we could speak together. Your ability, love of truth, and meekness, are well known to me ; and the angels and the whole world bear witness to your piety. I do not doubt, therefore, but that we shall soon be wholly agreed on this subject. Fain would I come and embrace you once more before we leave this world.' His apostrophe to him possesses singular beauty :— 'O, Philip Melancthon, to thee I now address myself ; to thee, who art now living in the presence of God with Jesus Christ, and there awaitest us till death shall unite us in the enjoyment of that divine peace. A hundred times hast thou said to me, when, weary with so much labour, and oppressed with so many burdens, thou laidst thy head upon my breast, God grant, God grant that I may die here ; and I, on my part, have a thousand times wished that we had the happiness to live together.' The letter of condolence also, which he wrote to the father of a young man who had been carried off by the plague, exceeds, as Henry remarks, in pathos any similar composition by Luther, and is conceived in the true spirit of the Gospel. The short view which we have of his domestic life, opens up similar scenes. After his death, it was found that all his goods and possessions amounted only to 200 dollars.

In the second part of his work, Dr. Henry becomes much more prolix and uninteresting than he had been when treating of Calvin's system of doctrine. In consequence, probably, of never having personally come into contact with any existing ecclesiastical

tical machinery framed in conformity with Calvin's views, there is a great want of distinctness and precision in his remarks. This is not at all compensated by the philosophic tone in which the subject is treated. A far better view of Calvin's ecclesiastical system may be obtained from the perusal of the fourth book of the Institutes; and we need scarcely say, that the now universally-acknowledged superiority of Calvin's exegetical writings, entitles him to a patient hearing on this subject—a subject on which the felt wants of many churches at the present day demand that light be earnestly sought, from whatever quarter it is at all likely to come. Perhaps the most pleasing portions of this section are those which exhibit the pastoral labours and the general activity of Calvin, his earnest desire to unite with all the true followers of Christ, and the extent to which he was willing, for the attainment of this end, to modify some even of his favourite views.

'As the breath of eternal life,' says Henry, 'seems to breathe through the whole of this great man's undertaking, so it is most conspicuously discoverable in his profound compassion for souls, and in his love for fellow-humanity. Even his exegetical writings have a practical tendency.' In a letter addressed to Farel, near the close of his life, we find him saying: 'When the messenger was prepared to take the beginning of my work with this letter, I had about twenty leaves to look through. I had then to lecture and preach, to write four letters, to make peace between some persons who had quarrelled with each other, and to answer more than ten people who came to me for advice. Forgive me, therefore, if I write only briefly of things.' In a variety of ways he laboured with incredible diligence to bring about a union in spirit, and also in practice, among all throughout the world, who should appear to be animated by the Spirit of Christ. Witness the progress that was actually made towards a general union among all the churches of the Reformation. The Zurich consensus bears testimony to this, as well as to the part taken by Calvin in the work. The remark of Henry is borne out by the events of his history, 'that in the midst of all the storms which raged without, Calvin's thoughts were ever directed to a system of general church polity, and to the establishment of the faith by a common confession; and that his soul contemplated the unity of the entire evangelical Church in Christ, its head and centre.'

The third part of Dr. Henry's work is intended to exhibit the efforts made by Calvin, in opposition to the heresies which arose among those who had left the communion of the Church of Rome. In this part, accordingly, we have full accounts of his controversy with Bolsec on Predestination, with Servetus on the Trinity,

Trinity, with Westphal and Hessius on the Sacrament, and with the libertines on the subject of discipline. Into the momentous questions involved in those controversies, it would be presumption to attempt to enter within the limits of a paper such as this. They involve points which have exercised the thoughts of the most powerful intellects which the world has ever seen, and which, because of the fundamental place which they occupy, are of transcendent importance; and it would be well if the views given by Henry did stimulate thoughtful minds to read and ponder what Calvin has written in regard to them. In regard to the part which Calvin acted personally towards his opponents, we would make the simple remark, that his conduct is to be judged of, not by the relations of modern society, or by principles which have been brought to light since his day, but by circumstances as they then existed, and by principles which, though they be justly repudiated now, were at that time universally acquiesced in. We make this remark chiefly in reference to the affair of Servetus, which Henry (if we except his remarks, which appear to us to be totally unfounded, as to the state of mind in which Servetus died) has done much to set before the world in its true light. His conduct towards the libertines stands in need of no such apology. The contest in this case was one between the triumphant reign of vice oppressing virtue, or that of virtue repressing vice. In the course of that contest, we meet with some instances of moral courage, such as the world has perhaps rarely seen. We shall give one of these in Henry's own words, after having related the circumstances which led to it. Philip Berthelier, the son of the Berthelier who lost his head in the cause of freedom in 1518, made his appearance at a time when Calvin was much distracted. He was greatly beloved by the people on account of his father's memory; but his disorderly life occasioned his expulsion from the Communicants in 1552, and the magistrates had ordered him to be cast into prison. He made an appeal to the Council against the ecclesiastical sentence. The case passed from the Council to 'the Senate of Two Hundred,' and was decided in favour of Berthelier, who received a document sealed with the seal of the Republic. It was believed that Calvin would either not obey the decree, and so be judged a rebel, or that he would yield; and in that case the power of the consistory would be for ever gone.

'It was on the Friday before the last Sunday in September, when the whole reformed Church celebrates the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, that Calvin received information of the plan against him. He instantly requested the Syndics to summon a meeting of the Council. He hastened hither himself, and in an earnest address endeavoured to convince

vince those who were present that it was their duty to revoke the decree. He concluded with protesting that he was resolved to die, rather than disgrace the celebration of the Lord's Supper in so unworthy a manner : "For nothing," he said, "can be worse than your proposing to let this man sport with the Church, and thus excite others by the impunity which he enjoys to the same insolence." The Council, however, answered that it would change nothing in its decree. Calvin, accordingly, formed in his heart the resolution to leave the city, or rather, he saw himself exposed to a second banishment. The important Sunday now arrived, September 3. The reformer ascended the pulpit ; his ardent eloquence was employed on the holy mysteries, and on those who despised them. At the end of his discourse, he raised his voice and admonished the congregation to receive the Sacrament with holy earnestness. He spoke with great force against those who despised the sacred rite, and, imitating the example of Chrysostom, declared that he would give the Sacrament to none of those who were excommunicated, and that if any one of them should attempt to seize the bread of the Lord by force, he would do so at his peril. Then, lifting up his hand, he exclaimed, "I will lose my life rather than let this hand give the holy things to those who have been pronounced despisers of God." These words sounded like a thunderclap, striking the excommunicated and his associates to the earth. Wonderfully affected himself, Berrini advised Berthelier himself not to approach the Lord's table ; and the Holy Supper, says Beza, was celebrated in the profoundest silence and with a holy awe, as if God himself had been visibly present in the assembly.'

The work of Mr. Dyer on Calvin is a totally different one from that of Dr. Henry. It is much superior to it as regards style of execution. Clearly and ably written, it carries the reader smoothly and rapidly along. It is a scholar-like production ; and abounds in graphic pictures of various interesting scenes connected with Calvin's life and times. But the whole spirit of the writer is in almost every important point very different from that of Calvin. The narrative is as faithful as could be expected from one who appears thoroughly to nauseate the leading doctrines, and to hate the great features of the character of the man whose life he writes. The serious-minded reader is surprised as well as annoyed at meeting in a life of Calvin such expressions as 'the jargon peculiar to the elect,' 'Calvin's conversion by a sudden call like *the new birth of the Methodists*,' 'Augustine's conversion to God being assisted by a *growing weakness of the lungs*, which disqualified him for the vocation which he followed at Milan of professor of rhetoric.' Election, the new birth, and the conversion of the soul to God, are doctrines of revelation, and are therefore not proper subjects for scoffing language. Few men acquainted with theological literature will be of opinion that Mr. Dyer has fully and fairly stated the real question at issue between Calvin and his
opponents,

opponents, on the subject of predestination. He has also shown himself incapable of analyzing the mental processes of the Christian mind. We refer especially to the conclusions which he draws from the correspondence connected with the return from Strasburg to Geneva, as to 'Calvin's consciousness that his conduct at Geneva had not been altogether just;' that 'his humiliation was mingled with pride;' and that 'his penitence was, or might be, *affected*.' He confounds things that are essentially different—viz. the view which the soul of a true Christian, impressed by a deep sense of the holiness of God, takes of his own actions as in God's presence, and the view taken of the same actions in their outward bearings upon men. A course of conduct perfectly justifiable in the latter point of view, will be acknowledged by every true Christian as in the former marked by much sin. But the most serious fault of the work is the constant recurrence of innuendos and insinuations against Calvin's character, many of which have no foundation anywhere on which to rest, except in the prejudiced imagination of the writer. Every incident or expression is laid hold of which can be represented in such a way as to convey an unfavourable impression. Great anxiety is shown to single out Calvin as being the only person of his day who held the doctrine that heretics or blasphemers should be put to death; whereas nothing is clearer on the face of history than that there was not a single man of that day of any party of whom we know anything who did not hold all that Calvin held on this subject. Calvin's view, moreover, was not that men should be put to death who merely held erroneous opinions, or who promulgated these opinions in a decent manner; witness his kind treatment of Socinus. It was only blasphemers, *i. e.* men who openly used abusive language or raillery at the most sacred things, that he considered ought to be treated in this way. And we need not tell Mr. Dyer that there are many of the expressions of Servetus of that revolting character that, if exposed to public view in the present day in London, they would bring down the interposition of the law. Calvin's conduct in the matter of Servetus is, of course, indefensible; but there is no reason why we should represent it worse than it really is.

J. T.

FIRST LESSONS IN BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

No. II.—CANON OF THE SCRIPTURES.

IN our former paper it was stated that the first question in Biblical criticism which we should consider, was that of canonical authority—and we now proceed to inquire what writings are to be regarded as forming the canon of the Scriptures.

The word canon means a 'rule' or 'standard.' It is thus used by Paul in Gal. vi. 16, 'As many as walk according to this *rule*, peace be on them and mercy, and upon the Israel of God.' In early times the word came to be used to signify the decrees of the church authorities. Thus the determinations or regulations of councils are called canons; and similar regulations falsely attributed to the Apostles are called the *Canons* of the Apostles. Thus also Eusebius in the early part of the fourth century, in giving a list of the books which Origen received as Scripture, says that Origen, 'keeping to the *ecclesiastical canon*, declares that he knew of only four gospels,'* where it is plain that Eusebius employs the word not as the designation of certain Christian writings, but to signify the *rule of the Church*. Indeed, it does not appear that the collection of sacred writings was at this time ever designated as 'the canon.' Eusebius himself speaks of them as 'the Catholic writings,' 'the acknowledged writings,' 'the inspired writings.' It would seem that the adjectives 'canonical' and 'canonized,' were employed to designate the Scriptures some time before the whole collection was termed the canon—and that in their first application to the Scriptures these words bore precisely the same meaning as the term canon according to Eusebius's use of it. The word canonical is thus used by the Council of Laodicea (A.D. 364), and the third Council of Carthage (A.D. 397), both of which declare that nothing except the *canonical* scriptures should be read in the church. The transition is easy from the designation of the writings as *canonical*, *i. e.* according to rule, to the use of the word canon to express the whole body of such writings. The canon of the Scriptures then seems properly to mean the whole body of writings which are acknowledged as the accredited documents of the Christian Church. Many writers, however, looking directly at the original meaning of the word canon, prefer to define it as being the

* Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* vi. 25.

whole body of writings which form the divine rule of faith and practice. Thus Dr. W. L. Alexander, in Kitto's *Cyclo.*, defines the canon as 'the authoritative standard of religion and morals composed of those writings which have been given for this purpose by God to men.' According to this view of the subject, the canonicity of the books would be the last instead of the first question for our consideration. We prefer the former definition as not only more in accordance with the historical use of the word; but more suitable to our present purpose. The difference between these two views is in itself of no importance; it is only of consequence that we should have a clear conception of the subject of our inquiry. If we were about to *determine* what are in reality the authorized documents of the Christian religion—that is, to form the canon—we must certainly take the wider definition to guide us; but our object is now merely to look at what *has been determined*, what is regarded by the Church in general as authoritative, and as therefore constituting the canon which has been formed. When this has been done, it will remain that we should inquire whether the books so accredited, are each and all of them worthy of the place they hold, that is, whether the canon has been *rightly* formed. And this must be done by examining the credentials of the separate books. It appears to us, too, that there is an advantage in point of clearness in thus limiting the meaning of the term we are discussing, not only because, in its more extended meaning, the inquiry into the canonicity of a book includes every part of our subject; but also because even on the supposition that we were to find any book, or portion of the Scriptures destitute of rightful claim to the place that it holds, we could scarcely refuse to it the title of canonical. In fact there are books, as we all know, received into, and forming part of the canon of the Romish Church, which we may feel bound to reject. If now these very books were rejected only by a few critics, though on ever so valid grounds, they could not on that account be called uncanonical. They might have no legitimate authority; but they would still be part of the canon. It is only when we turn to another canon which repudiates them and judge them by that rule, that the designation uncanonical can fairly be applied to them.

The canonical books then are the books accredited by the Church. We have to inquire—what these books are;—whether the canon thus established has been uniformly the same;—if not, which collection or canon is to be recognized. Our inquiry, therefore, it will be seen, is almost entirely an historical one. We have to look rather at the external circumstances and fortune of the books, than at their internal character. We are to hear the
testimony

testimony of others respecting them rather than to examine their own testimony. And here it will not be out of place for us to say a word or two on the frequently agitated question, what weight is due to the testimony of antiquity, or to the voice and decision of 'the Church.' That it is not of itself, and at once decisive of the questions we have proposed to discuss, is assumed in the very fact of discussing them. There would plainly be no room for the science of 'Biblical Criticism' at all, if the Church authoritatively settled every point. At best, it would be but an art. And its highest aim would be to classify and arrange the dicta of the Church, so as to put them in such a form as that they might be most easily remembered. The extravagance of the claims made on behalf of the traditions of the Church, has led many to the opposite extreme of underrating and speaking slightly of all traditionary and historical testimony—forgetting that the Bible, which they erroneously place in opposition to tradition, is accredited to them in no small degree by that very tradition. The voice of the Church is of weight. It is not lightly to be rejected; nor because its authority has been exalted too highly, ought we to think it of small importance. In matters of historical fact, the testimony of antiquity is the foundation on which we must rest, and thus in this case the testimony of the Church must determine what is and what is not *canonical* in the sense we have given to the word. The further question, whether what is canonical is also true and rightly authoritative, is one which, according to our view, no Church authority can settle. This, it is the high prerogative and solemn duty of each individual man to determine for himself.

In the present inquiry then, our first and chief appeal is to the testimony of the Church—not to its decisions by Councils merely, nor to its decisions in any way as being *authoritative* and final, in respect to what a man is to believe; but to the testimony that we can gather from its history as to a matter of fact, viz., what have been the views of Christians in general in reference to their accredited writings in past ages—especially in the earliest times. If that testimony were uniform and consistent, if there were but one voice, the question before us would be settled; if the far-famed test of Vincentius of Lerins (*quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus*) were fulfilled, since this is a case to which it might properly be applied, it would absolutely determine the matter. When we ask what books are *regarded* as forming the authoritative standard, if there were an answer which had been given 'everywhere and always and by all,' we should have nothing to do but to listen to it. But every one knows that this is not the case; there are books deemed canonical by some, and rejected by other large sections

sections of the Church. And consequently we have to weigh conflicting claims, to look further than the mere fact that certain books have been deemed canonical, and to inquire into the grounds on which some of these books have been received into the canon by some, and have been rejected from it by others. Our first and main inquiry will still be an historical one; and we shall find that we need scarcely, if at all, go beyond the ground of history. When we do, it will be rather to confirm its decision, than by any independent inquiry of our own to ascertain the intrinsic merits of the books claiming to be canonical—that, as we have said, is a subject which must hereafter engage our attention. At present we wish to ascertain what are the accredited documents of the Church, and in case of dispute on this point, which amongst rival claimants we are to receive and which we must reject.

With regard to the Old Testament, the books forming the Canon have come down to us accredited by the authority of the Jewish Church. According to Jewish tradition the formation of the Canon was the work of Ezra and the 'Great Synagogue.' We are not inclined to rely so firmly on this tradition as many have done. The Jewish accounts of Ezra's services are unquestionably mixed up with much that is fabulous. And further, there can be no doubt but that the books previously written formed a canon, or ascertained collection, before the time of Ezra. The historical ground of the tradition we take to be that Ezra, on the return of the Jews from the captivity, had the chief authority in the direction of religious affairs, and of course was careful to preserve and keep entire the collection of sacred books. The tradition assumes more than this, viz., that Ezra formed and settled the whole Canon as a prophet, that is, under special divine direction and superintendence. When we remember that there was no such special direction given with regard to the books of the New Testament, we may reasonably doubt whether it was so in the earlier case.

The great practical inconvenience of resting the authority of the Jewish Canon on the fact of its being formed by Ezra seems to us to be that the evidence for the fact is at least not without exception, and if that is felt to fail, the proof of the canonical authority may be thought to fail with it. It is the evil of attempting to prove too much, which in the end is sure to damage the cause it is intended to serve. It matters little, as it seems to us, by what particular man or body of men the Canon was finally determined. All that we need to know is, that the writings which we at present regard as the Scriptures of the Old Testament were thus received by the Jewish Church. Without further inquiry

then into the author or authors of the Canon, we proceed to inquire what was the Canon before the time of Christ.

The books which constitute the Old Testament of the English Bible are those which also constitute the Hebrew Scriptures; these, and these only, are received as canonical by the Jews, and there is every reason to believe that this same collection was thus received by their fathers in the time of our Lord. It will be proper to notice in the outset the Jewish division of these books into three parts, called the Law, the Prophets, and the Writings, or, as the Greek name *Hagiographa* expresses, the Sacred Writings. The first of these consists of the five books of Moses, the second is divided into two parts called the former and the latter prophets. In the former division are included Joshua, Judges, the two Books of Samuel, and two Books of Kings; in the latter, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the twelve minor prophets from Hosea to Malachi, in the same order as they are found in our English Bibles. The third portion—the *Hagiographa*—contains all the other books in the following order:—Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Solomon's Song, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, the two Books of Chronicles. That these books constituted the Jewish Canon we have ample proof. The only point of question is, whether certain other books which are found in the Greek Septuagint translation of the Old Testament, but not in the Hebrew Bible, should be also included. These are the books which we know under the name of Apocrypha. They consist in part of additions to the received books of Esther and Daniel, and in part of independent works. In the Greek translation they appear, not as an appendix, but as they do also in the authorized Latin version, mingled up with the other books. There seems then to be no doubt that they were received as in some sort forming part of the Canon by those who used the Greek version, that is, by the Jews of Alexandria; and from them a large portion of the Christian church has received them. The question then which we have to ask is, Ought we to receive them? The answer to this question will partly be given in our investigation of the claims of the Jewish Canon in general.

Our first testimony in behalf of the Jewish Canon is that of the New Testament. We find throughout the New Testament the Jewish Scriptures referred to as a well-known and authoritative collection of writings. The three-fold division which we have spoken of above is mentioned by our Lord himself in Luke xxiv. 44, where he speaks of 'all things written concerning himself in the law of Moses and the Prophets, and the Psalms.' Not only do the writers of the New Testament assume the authority of the Jewish Scriptures, but by far the greater number of the books are
quoted

quoted or referred to as authoritative. The list of those not quoted is given differently by different writers. We believe the following will be found a complete list of those which cannot be *certainly* identified by any reference in the New Testament:—Ruth, 1 & 2 Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Lamentations, Obadiah, Nahum, Zephaniah. The book of Ezekiel is sometimes included in this list, but though it is not expressly quoted in the New Testament, the allusions to it in the Apocrypha are so numerous and of such a kind that we may fairly consider the book to be identified and authenticated by them. On the other hand, some of those which we have mentioned are frequently excluded from this list on the ground of some like expressions in the New Testament. This is especially the case with the books of Chronicles, which are often regarded as having the explicit sanction of the New Testament in consequence of events in Jewish history being referred to which are there recorded. There is, however, no reference which can be shown to belong peculiarly to these books, unless indeed it be Matt. xxiii. 35, and the parallel passage in Luke. Most of the other books not expressly referred to are short treatises, and, instead of being surprised at the number not mentioned, we might rather feel astonished that so many are referred to and identified when we consider that all the references occur incidentally. On the other hand, not one of the books called Apocrypha is cited, or even distinctly referred to, by any of the writers of the New Testament. This is the more remarkable, as the sacred writers most frequently quote from the Greek version, in which these writings are now incorporated, and in which they were probably found at that time.

The testimony of Josephus respecting the Jewish Sacred Books is very valuable.

‘We have not,’ he says, ‘myriads of books discordant and disagreeing, but only two-and-twenty books, containing the history of all time, which are justly believed to be divine. And of these five are those of Moses, which contain both the laws and the account of the human race from its origin to his death. This period is but little less than three thousand years. And from the death of Moses to the reign of Artaxerxes, the successor of Xerxes, King of the Persians, the prophets who succeeded Moses wrote the transactions of their times in thirteen books; and the other four contain hymns to God and practical counsels for men. And from the time of Artaxerxes to our own days every thing has been written, but these accounts have not been deemed worthy of the same credit as those which preceded them, because the succession of the prophets was not certain. And how greatly we trust to our own writings is manifest by facts: for though so long a period has now passed by, no one has dared either to add or to take away anything from them, or to alter them; indeed, it is implanted in all Jews

from their very birth, to regard these as the commands of God, and to continue in them, and for them, if needful, willingly to die.'^b

That Josephus does not include the Apocryphal books in his Canon is manifest. This is the more to be noticed, because there can be no doubt he was acquainted with the Septuagint version, since he gives an account of its origin. Thus far is clear. But the question is more difficult, whether he includes *all* the books of the Hebrew Bible, which in our English version amount to thirty-nine. In seeking to ascertain what are the books he refers to, it must be stated, in the first place, that twenty-two was fixed upon by the Jewish Rabbis as the number of their Sacred Books, because that is the number of letters in the Hebrew alphabet; and the books were made to agree with this number by reckoning two of the same kind, or several smaller ones together, as one book: thus 1 & 2 Samuel, 1 & 2 Kings, 1 & 2 Chronicles were each reckoned as one. Thus, too, the twelve minor prophets were grouped together as one book. It is likely, further, that Ruth was annexed to Judges, Lamentations to Jeremiah, and that Ezra and Nehemiah were reckoned as one. In this way the number of the books is reduced to twenty-two. Still this division does not agree in order with the present three-fold division of the Hebrew Scriptures. It is certain that Josephus must have reckoned amongst the prophets several of the books now included in the *Hagiographa*, and we may most probably conjecture that these books were Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah, Esther, Job and Daniel. The arrangement of Josephus, according to this plan, will stand thus:—

I. THE LAW.

1. Genesis.
2. Exodus.
3. Leviticus.
4. Numbers.
5. Deuteronomy.

II. PROPHETS.

1. Joshua.
2. Judges, with Ruth.
3. Samuel 1 & 2.
4. Kings 1 & 2.
5. Isaiah.
6. Jeremiah, with Lamentations.

7. Ezekiel.

8. Twelve minor prophets.

Add to these from the *Hagiographa*:—

9. Chronicles 1 & 2.
10. Ezra and Nehemiah.
11. Esther.
12. Job.
13. Daniel.

III. HYMNS.

1. Psalms.
2. Proverbs.
3. Ecclesiastes.
4. Song of Solomon.

We have not space to enter into further detail of the testimonies for the Hebrew Scriptures. We can only mention that Philo

^b Joseph. c. *Apion*, i. 8.

quotes most of them as authoritative, but, according to Horne-mann, does not ever quote from the Apocryphal books; and that Melito, Bishop of Sardis (A.D. 170), gives a list of the Jewish Sacred Books which accords with our present Canon, except that he omits the mention of Nehemiah, Lamentations, and Esther. As to the two former, it is most probable that he, as we have seen reason to think was the case with Josephus, included Nehemiah under Ezra, and Lamentations under Jeremiah. The omission of Esther is not so easily accounted for. The most important point in his testimony is that he mentions none of the Apocryphal books.

Our sketch of the evidence on which the Jewish Canon rests has at the same time shown that the larger collection of the Alexandrian Jews is not thus verified, in so far as it differs from the Hebrew Canon. Writers of the Romish Church, however, endeavour to find other evidence on which to rest the claim of the Apocryphal books. Such as the decisions of various Councils, *e.g.* that of Hippo, A.D. 393, and of Carthage, A.D. 397; the testimony of Augustine Bishop of Hippo, who gives a list including the Apocryphal books; the quotations made from various Apocryphal books by early fathers; and their being included both in the Greek Bible and in the Latin version of it. It does not appear, however, that even in the Romish Church the books which we call Apocrypha were ever regarded generally as holding the same rank with the other part of the canon, indeed it is certain that they were distinguished from that by many of the early fathers, even though they made use of them. The disputes which arose at the time of the Reformation led to a formal decision by the Council of Trent affirming the canonical authority of all the books contained in the Latin version, including the Apocrypha, and also of the unwritten 'traditions' preserved by continual succession in the Catholic Church. After enumerating all these books the decree proceeds thus—'If any one shall not receive these books entire with all their parts, as they have been accustomed to be read in the Catholic Church, and are found in the ancient Vulgate Latin edition, as sacred and canonical, and shall knowingly and advisedly despise the aforesaid traditions, let him be anathema.' This decree would seem decisive as to the judgment of the Romish Church, not only in respect to the books, but also the version which it regards as canonical. Some writers of that community still contend, however, that this decree does not place the Apocryphal books, which they name 'Deuterocanonical,' in the same rank with those recognized by the Hebrew Canon. They maintain that it simply affirms that the books ought not to be formally distinguished into two lists, and that they

they all are to be regarded in the light in which the Church had been accustomed theretofore to regard them; that is, according to these writers, that the reading of the Apocryphal or Deuterocanonical books in the churches was useful for the edification of the people, but that they were not of sufficient authority for the establishment of doctrines.* This seems to be very nearly the view taken by the framers of the Articles of the English Church; where in the 6th Article it is said, 'In the name of the Holy Scripture we do understand those Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church;' then follows a list of the books usually designated the Books of the Old Testament (where Nehemiah is styled the second Book of Esdras); and the Article proceeds, 'And the other Books (as Hierome saith) the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners, but yet doth it not apply them to establish any doctrine;' then follows a list of the books usually termed Apocrypha.

Enough has probably been said to show that the Apocryphal books of the Old Testament have no valid claim to be placed upon an equal footing with the Hebrew Scriptures. At best, they can only be called Deuterocanonical, meaning thereby that they have been received by some as in some sense canonical; they cannot, however, substantiate any satisfactory historical claim even to this title. We may add that some of these books themselves seem to disclaim any such authority. Thus the writer of the Prologue to the book of Ecclesiasticus refers to the Jewish Scriptures under the threefold division which we have noticed above, but does not give the least hint that the book he was publishing, written, as he says, by his grandfather, was to be included amongst them. So, too, the writer of 2 Maccabees closes his history by saying, 'Here I end the discourse, and if [it be done] well and accurately, it is what I wished, but if meanly and moderately, this was what I could attain.' We can barely allude to other Jewish writings which have still less claims to be considered canonical than those termed Apocrypha. The most important of these is the book of Enoch. This work, in its entire state, has come down to us only in an Ethiopic translation, copies of which were brought over to this country by the traveller Bruce. The book has been made accessible to English readers by Archbishop Laurence, who published a translation of it into English in 1833. It is chiefly remarkable as containing the passage quoted by Jude. Whether that quotation were made from the Book of Enoch as it now exists, is a question the discussion of

* See Jahn, *Introd.* in *V. T.* § 29, 30.

which we cannot at present enter on. However this may be, no one who reads the book can doubt that it is neither a genuine nor an authentic production. And though it is quoted by some of the fathers, for example, Tertullian, who writes in defence of it, it has never been regarded as forming part of the canon.

We come now to the writings of the New Testament. It is clear from the books themselves that they were written, not only at different times and places, but for different and distinct communities. In this respect they differ remarkably from the books constituting the Old Testament. The latter were the authorized religious documents of the whole Jewish people, and it is in the highest degree probable that the most important portions of them at least were from the time of their publication received by the Jewish Church as constituting parts of the body of Divine writings—that is, as forming from time to time their canon. In respect, however, to the Christian writings there were no means of thus assembling them immediately together; they were not in the possession of all Christians, but of distinct churches widely separated from each other. The earliest instruction of the different Christian Churches must of necessity have been oral, with regard both to the facts and the doctrines of Christianity. Each community would naturally prize most highly such written instructions as they received from their first teachers, and especially those which were given to them by the Apostles. Thus it would be with the epistles which Paul and other Apostles addressed to different communities or individuals. It would be natural, as the first living teachers and eye-witnesses were gradually withdrawn by death, that their written instructions should be even more eagerly sought for and more highly valued. Those churches which had not any such written documents of their own would naturally seek to obtain copies of writings in the possession of other more favoured churches; and these, too, would gladly avail themselves of apostolic instructions addressed to other communities. Thus, in very early times, collections of such writings, more or less complete, would be formed. In the same way the Gospels written in different parts of the world, though not especially addressed to different Christian communities, would in no long period be collected together, that as full an account as possible of the Life of Jesus might be in the hands of the disciples. We may further regard it as exceedingly probable that there would be other writings than those which were finally received into the canon held in esteem by particular churches to whom they might have been addressed or with whom they might have originated. Still further it ought not to surprise us if we found that the eager desire to possess written memorials from the founders of the Christian

Christian faith should occasion either imperfect traditions or even pure inventions to be written down, and given forth under the assumed sanction of some apostolic name.

All these circumstances, which beforehand we might expect, are found to have really taken place in the course of the settlement of the canon. The earliest Christian writers refer to or quote single books of the New Testament, but do not refer to it as a whole. The earliest names for the collected books were 'the Gospel,' under which title was included the evangelical narratives, and 'the Apostle,' which contained the epistles and other books. How soon such collections were made it is impossible for us to ascertain. The old Syriac version, named the *Peshito*, may certainly be taken as containing the most ancient collection that has come down to our times. In it we find all the books of the New Testament, except 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, Jude, and the Apocalypse. This version carries us back to a period as early in all probability as the second century. It is certain, too, that nearly, if not quite, all the books of the New Testament were in the hands of the Christian writers who flourished at the end of the second and the beginning of the third centuries. Tertullian, for instance, not only classes the sacred writings under the two divisions we have mentioned as the 'Gospel of the Lord' and the 'Letters of the Apostle,' but quotes from or refers to all the books of the New Testament, except Philemon, 2 Peter, and 3 John.

We must refer to this period a fragment discovered by Muratori, and attributed by him to Caius Presbyter of Rome (about A.D. 196), which contains, if not the earliest, certainly one of the first lists of canonical books that has been handed down to us. In this list we find nearly all the canonical books in their present order, together with some which we look upon as apocryphal. The list omits all mention of the Epistle to the Hebrews, both Epistles of Peter, that of James, and one of John's Epistles.

The fragment commences with Luke's Gospel, which it speaks of as being the third. We may, therefore, fairly conclude that Matthew and Mark were originally included in the list. It proceeds with John, the Acts, thirteen Epistles of Paul, Jude, two Epistles of John. The book of Wisdom, 'written by the friends of Solomon in his honour,' is next mentioned, and the document proceeds—

'The Apocalypse also of John and of Peter we receive only thus far, that some amongst us are unwilling that they should be read in the church. But the Shepherd Hermas wrote very lately in our own times in the city of Rome; his brother Pius, the bishop, occupying the chair in the church of the city of Rome. And thus it be-
hoves

hoves indeed that it should be read ; but that it should be published in the church to the people is possible neither amongst the prophets, their number being completed, nor amongst the Apostles to the end of time.'

The last sentence is obscure ; we have given it as literally as we could. It seems to show that the book, though read, was not reckoned in the canon.

In the list given in the Apostolic Constitutions, which, though a spurious document, is probably not later than the latter part of the third century, the Apocalypse is omitted ; and the two Epistles of Clement of Rome and the Constitutions themselves, which profess to be written down by him, are included.

The list of books, received as canonical by Origen, who died A.D. 254, is preserved to us by Eusebius. It mentions Paul's Epistles generally, and refers the Epistle to the Hebrews to him in substance, but considers it to have been written down by some one else. No mention is made of James or Jude, though Origen refers to both of them in his own writings, yet with some degree of doubt. He mentions also doubtfully the 2nd Epistle of Peter and the 2nd and 3rd Epistles of John. In other respects his canon is that which is generally received.

We come now to Eusebius, Bishop of Cæsarea (died A.D. 340). To him we are indebted, not only for the canon of Origen, just cited, but for the most complete account of the view taken by the Ancient Church of the canonical writings. His testimony is so important and so full, that we shall give it at length :—

'It will be fitting here,' he says, 'to sum up the writings of the New Testament which have been spoken of ; and in the first place, we must set down the holy quaternion of the Gospels. There follows these the book of the Acts of the Apostles, and after that are to be classed the Epistles of Paul ; following which what is considered the first Epistle of John, and likewise that of Peter are to be ratified. To these is to be added, if at least it should appear so, the Apocalypse of John, the opinions concerning which we will refer to in their place. And these are amongst the books universally acknowledged (*homologoumena*). But of those that are objected to (*antilegomena*), but yet recognized by the many, there are, that which is called the Epistle of James, and that of Jude, likewise the second Epistle of Peter, and those that are named the second and third of John, whether they are the writings of the Evangelist or of some one else having the same name. Amongst the spurious (*nothoi*) let there be classed both the book of the Acts of Paul and that which is called the Shepherd, and the Revelation of Peter, and with these what is considered the Epistle of Barnabas, and the teaching so called of the Apostles ; and further, as was said, the Revelation of John if it should appear so ; which some, as was said, reject, but others decide to be amongst those

those universally acknowledged: and now amongst these some also class the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which chiefly those of the Hebrews who have received Christ delight in. All these may be considered as belonging to the writings objected to (*antilegomena*). Yet we have of necessity made a list of these also, distinguishing between the writings which according to the ecclesiastical tradition are true, and genuine, and agreed upon, and the others beside these, not received into the Testament, but objected to, and yet by most ecclesiastical writers recognized, that we may have the means of knowing both these and those writings which are put forth by the heretics under the name of the Apostles, such as those containing the Gospels of Peter, and of Thomas, and of Matthias, or of some others besides these, or the Acts of Andrew, and John, and of the other Apostles; not one of which any man in the list of those who are in the succession of the Church ever thought fit to mention at all; and besides, both the style of writing, so different from the Apostolic manner, and the sentiment and the character of the things brought forward in them, so very dissimilar from true orthodoxy, clearly establish that they are the fictions of heretical men. Wherefore they are not to be placed even amongst the spurious books, but are to be renounced as altogether absurd and impious.^d

We see then that Eusebius divided all the writings which laid any claim to be considered as authoritative in the Church into three classes:—1. Those universally acknowledged. 2. Those objected to; and 3. The heretical. The last he wholly rejects. The first contains the four Gospels, the Acts, the [fourteen] Epistles of Paul (thus including the Epistle to the Hebrews), the 1st Epistle of John, and 1st of Peter. These he terms universally acknowledged (*homologoumena*). That he intends to attribute fourteen Epistles to Paul, is manifest from other parts of his works, *e.g.* ‘the fourteen Epistles [of Paul] are manifest and clear.’ In other places he mentions that objections had been made to the Pauline origin of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and refers to the hypothesis that it had been written by Paul in Hebrew, and translated by some one else into Greek. There is, therefore, ample reason for concluding that in his list he included it under the designation of Paul’s Epistles. The second class, those which have been objected to (*antilegomena*), he subdivides into two distinct parts: 1. Those which though objected to were yet recognized by the many; and 2. The spurious books. In the first division we find all the remaining books of our present canon; in the second those which, though sometimes read and sometimes included in the lists of sacred books, were yet never generally sanctioned as authoritative. The Church gradually, but very decidedly, divided this class in pre-

^d Euseb. *Eccles. Hist.* iii. 25.

cisely the same way as Eusebius has done ; and the line of demarcation between the two divisions became continually more clear. All the books 'objected to, but yet acknowledged by the many,' were soon reckoned as canonical, and all the 'spurious' were soon completely cast aside, and their claim to canonical authority disallowed—after which they gradually sank into disuse. It should be remarked, that the term *antilegomena* is very commonly spoken of as employed by Eusebius in reference only to the books now received into the canon, the authority of which in early times was considered doubtful. It seems to us that the view we have given is that taken by Eusebius himself. Later ages and more critical investigations have separated between the valuable and the comparatively worthless in this class ; and whilst the former are by this separation raised to the rank of canonical writings, the latter are definitively rejected. Thus the writings which Eusebius places in juxtaposition, are now considered widely apart. It well deserves our consideration that subsequent ages have only served to confirm his judgment of the whole subject. Out of the class of those 'objected to,' all that Eusebius speaks of favourably have been received, and all that he considers spurious have been rejected. There could be no more striking proof of the care and the skill exercised by the early church in their determination of the canon. The treatment of the Apocalypse by Eusebius is curious, and deserves to be noted. He classes it, though with an expression of doubt, amongst the books universally received, and mentions it again in case its place there should be disallowed, not with the better part of the *antilegomena*, but with the spurious. It would seem, therefore, that both advocates and opponents of this book took higher ground respecting it than was taken in reference to any other book, the canonical authority of which was impugned. Whilst some claimed for it a degree of authority which was not claimed for these, others altogether rejected it as unworthy of even a secondary place. Eusebius himself seems, in fact, to have been in doubt as to the author of the book. But his including it amongst the *Homologoumena*, even though doubtfully, shows that it was at least very generally received in his day.

We see the increasing consistency of the canon in the writings of Athanasius. His list included all the present canonical books, neither more nor less ; the only difference being in their order ; the seven Catholic Epistles came immediately after the Acts, then 'the fourteen Epistles of Paul,' *i. e.* including the Epistle to the Hebrews, in the order in which we have them now, except that the Epistle to the Hebrews comes immediately after 2 Thessalonians. He afterwards mentions, together with some books of the Jewish Apocrypha, the books 'called the Teaching of the Apostles and the

the Shepherd,' as not indeed *canonical*; but yet conducive to instruction in piety. Here, then, we see, that the interval of separation between canonical and uncanonical has become wider.

After this time, scarcely any list contains any apocryphal work of the New Testament. The chief difference between them is in respect to the Apocalypse. Thus in the fourth century this book is omitted in the list given by the Laodicean Council, and that by Cyril of Jerusalem, and is included in the canon as given by the Council of Carthage, by Epiphanius, and by Jerome.* After this time lists of the canonical books are frequent, nearly all containing the Apocalypse, whilst a few include some one or two of the apocryphal books.

There is, however, after all, not one of the uncanonical books, the claims of which deserve our serious attention. We had thought of discussing somewhat in detail the pretensions of the books that have now and then been included in the Canonical Catalogue. But having arrived at this stage of our investigation, we feel that such a discussion would be both tedious and useless. We have seen that there is not one treatise omitted from the present New Testament canon that can with any degree of plausibility claim to have a place there on the strength of historical testimony. And it is to this point that our investigation has been almost exclusively confined. If now for a moment we step beyond these limits, and look at the style and general character of the New Testament apocrypha, we shall only have the verdict of the Church confirmed. We shall see everywhere in the extra-canonical writings striking evidences of the wide difference between them and the canonical books—differences affecting the whole colour and tone of the compositions; differences of such a kind as that while the books of the New Testament seem to speak to us in the tone of one who has authority, these seem to give the same lessons at second hand—or differences of such a kind as that while the canonical narratives state facts the most astonishing in the simplest manner, and so as to show that the statements are made merely because they are true, these are ever pressing upon us with wonders related for no conceivable purpose but to astonish us. Many of the apocryphal books are clearly spurious; the better part of them—such, for instance, as Clement's Epistle—are really valuable; not however as furnishing us with authoritative statements, but as giving us a living picture of the teaching and discipline of the early Church. Clement's Epistle is,

* We refer those who are desirous of more detailed information as to the historical documents respecting the New Testament canon to Kirchhofer's valuable work entitled 'Quellensammlung zur Geschichte des N. T. Canons bis auf Hieronymus.' Zürich, 1844.

indeed, just such in substance as a good man and an influential pastor might send to a community of Christians at present, whose spiritual welfare he sought, and over whom he had influence. But even if the extra-canonical writings were ten times more valuable and important than any of them are, they would be utterly useless as authoritative documents, their testimony could decide no disputed point, on the simple ground that their authority is not recognized. They may be admitted as evidence—they cannot give sentence as judges. If their teaching agrees with that of the canonical books, it is on the ground of this agreement, and not from any weight in their testimony that their statements are to be received.

We may then be assured that all the Christian writings which are to be looked upon as authoritative, are in the canon of the New Testament. And further, that all the writings which we have valid grounds for judging that the Jews received as of Divine authority, are included in that of the Old Testament. We have thus cleared our way to the more special examination of these books, with the certainty that we are not omitting any authoritative record of the Divine will. It will be our task now to ascertain whether these books, each and all having thus a *primâ facie* claim on our attention, are to be regarded as true; first historically, and then in the far higher sense of being a revelation from God. Meanwhile we may well pause here and admire the goodness of Divine providence—in having thus without miracle, by *natural* means, selected and kept entire, and marked out by so decided a line of separation from all other writings existing in the world, those books which we are accustomed to look upon as containing the authoritative declarations of Divine truth. Written in different languages, in ages distant from each other and from our own, in countries widely separated, addressed to nations, provinces, cities, individuals; scattered abroad, and *apparently* left to all the changes of time and circumstance in the wide world; they have survived all accidents, they have out-lived the changes of nations, the heresies of doctrine, the attacks of enemies, and stand out preserved and kept distinct by the overruling providence of Him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will, that they may transmit some portion of that will from generation to generation, and may thus be the means of enlightening, and purifying, and saving men to the end of time.

F. W. G.

ON THE
INTERPRETATION OF 1 CORINTHIANS,

CHAP. VII. 25-40.

THE interpretation of this passage, which has been generally adopted by commentators, is that which refers the word virgin, in the 36th verse, to an unmarried daughter or ward, and which explains the expression 'behaveth himself uncomely' in that verse, by the father or guardian keeping such a person from marrying under circumstances that might savour of cruelty, or injustice, or harshness, or that might constitute his so doing imprudent or inconsiderate.

Locke and Whitby, indeed, refer the expression to a man's own conduct to himself, and to the exercise of a due regard for his own feelings and happiness in determining whether he will remain unmarried or not; and Doddridge also at one time adopted this view, but the first mentioned is, I believe, the one now almost universally received.

I think, however, that neither of these can fairly, and without considerable violence to the phraseology, be received, and that the passage is susceptible of another interpretation more consistent with the general tenour of the Apostle's address, and which, so far from requiring any force to produce a consistency between the different words employed, will give to each form by which the expression is varied, its proper and peculiar shade of meaning.

In endeavouring to prove this it may, perhaps, be best to point out the apparent discrepancies in phraseology which seem to throw an ambiguity over the passage, and to notice the hitherto proposed interpretations no farther than as they may be thought to obviate the difficulties or to leave them untouched.

The first difficulty occurs in the paragraph beginning with the 25th verse, 'Now concerning virgins,' and ending with the words 'it is good for a man to be so,' in the 26th, in which the Apostle begins with speaking of virgins as a class, and ends with what seems irrelevant or unconnected, namely a decision respecting the case of a man. Another diversity in the language is found in the 34th verse, the introductory clause of which states that there is a difference between a wife and a virgin, while in the concluding clause the word *ἄγαμος*, the unmarried woman, is used instead of *παρθένος*. This may be, however, accounted for on the ground that

that the former word marks more forcibly the antithesis to the word *γαμήσασα*, or the married woman.

The next difficulty arises from the word *γαμείτωσιν*, let them marry, at the end of the 36th verse. Two persons are certainly spoken of in the beginning of the verse; and if they were the parties to whom it was supposed that the words, let them marry, applied, there would be no ambiguity in the use of the plural verb. This however is not the supposition, according to the generally received interpretation, and the difficulty can only be evaded so as to harmonize with that by conjecturing that the Apostle, after speaking of a special case, concluded by saying, let them marry, that is, virgins, at large or under such circumstances, or by introducing a third party not hitherto or subsequently spoken of, and explaining the let them marry, by let the virgin in question, and he who seeks her in wedlock, marry. Both of these explanations are attended with difficulty, nor does either of them present what may be called an obvious reason for the use of the plural verb; but they seem totally irreconcilable with the words that follow, which evidently refer to a struggle in a man's own mind, and one of a very different character from what he would entertain in deciding whether he would give an unmarried daughter or ward in marriage. If this was the matter at issue, it would be natural to expect that, if any reference was made by the Apostle to the guardian's office or duty in the matter, his judgment, and discretion, and regard for her welfare, would be the topics and not his 'standing stedfast in his *own heart*,' 'having no necessity,' 'having *power over his own will*,' &c. No language could be used more forcibly significant of the requisite considerations on the part of the individual who was to decide whether he or she herself should remain unmarried, none more harsh or inappropriate in expressing the part to be taken by a parent or guardian in deciding whether a daughter or ward should do so. Can we suppose that the Apostle, immediately after having disavowed all wish or intention to cast a snare upon those whom he addresses, by making celibacy a matter of divine or apostolical obligation, thus admitting that any celibacy but a voluntary one was an unjustifiable snare, and after declaring that he only advised it owing to the peculiar circumstances of the times, would sanction, much less counsel, that a parent or guardian should make the celibacy of their daughter or ward to depend, not upon the being or standing 'firm in heart,' 'ἑδραῖος ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ,' 'not having necessity,' 'μὴ ἔχων ἀνάγκην,' the having 'power over their own proper or *individual will*,' 'ἐξουσίαν περὶ τοῦ ἰδίου θελήματος' of the parties themselves, but on that of others. All these clearly point out that they refer to a decision connected with the individuals'

viduals' own qualifications, and to the question of their own celibacy or marriage.

There is also a peculiarity in the structure of the conclusion of this verse which is not preserved in the received translation. The words in the original are *καὶ τοῦτο κέχρικεν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ, τοῦ τηρεῖν*, and are translated in our version, and hath so decreed in his heart that he will keep his virgin. But more strictly it should be, and hath decided this, *i. e.* this thing or point in his own heart, for the sake of keeping his virgin. This structure, so far as it can influence the subject, tends to confirm the view that the decision is one in a man's own mind of his own final opinion or firmness in selecting and adhering to a celibate life, but a decision upon this point, entered into not merely on its own account, and with reference to himself alone, but for the sake of some ulterior object and with a reference to the position and interests of another party, that is, of the virgin. The following verse distinctly proves that the decision is connected with the future prospects of the virgin by the use of the word *ἐκγαμιζων*, giving in marriage, and in this respect it harmonizes with the interpretation which refers the whole passage to a parent or guardian's decision respecting his daughter or ward; but to this interpretation we have already seen that the word *γαμεῖτωσαν* opposes considerable difficulty, and the terms and structure of the 37th verse, almost insuperable objections. These considerations have led some commentators to refer the word *παρθένον* to a man's unmarried state; but while we must admit the force of the difficulties that led them to seek for some other interpretation than that which has been considered, there seem to be still greater objections to that which has been proposed in its place, for it requires no small violence to the language to translate '*ἀσχημονεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν παρθένον*,' to act an unbecoming or unjust part to himself by continuing in his married state, and '*τηρεῖν τὴν αὐτοῦ παρθένον*,' to keep himself single, and '*ἐκγαμιζων*,' he that marrieth.

From an examination of the whole passage it would appear that an interpretation is called for in which the position, interests, and prospects of two parties will be shown to be concerned, and so connected and involved, as to afford an obvious and natural sense to the expression *ἀσχημονεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν παρθένον*, behave himself unseemly to his virgin, and a sufficient reason for the use of the plural verb *γαμεῖτωσαν*, let them marry. It should also give to the expressions *ἰδραῖος*, firm, &c., in the 37th verse, such a connection as will agree with their evident import and due significance as applying to a decision in a person's own mind respecting his choice of, and adherence to, a state of celibacy, while it preserves the force of the structure, *ἐνεκα τοῦ τηρεῖν*, by attributing the necessity

necessity or cause of this decision to be not merely the question of a man's marrying or not, and a regard for his own prospects, but its having a reference to some other object and to the interests and prospects of another person. It is also requisite that the interpretation should be such as calls for the use of the word ἐγκαμίζων, in the 38th verse, or, if we receive Griesbach's reading, of ἐγκαμίζων in the first, and γαμίζων in the last clause of that verse.

The word μεμέρισται in the 34th verse, which seems to be an emphatic word and the absence of any connective particle to join it with what precedes, is another point worthy of notice. If the Apostle had intended nothing more than to assert that the observation respecting the immunity from worldly carefulness which characterized the unmarried man, applied to the virgin or unmarried woman also, it would have been quite sufficient to have prefixed the word οὕτως to ἡ ἄγαμος, and indeed this would have been the natural expression. Even if the introduction of the word μεμέρισται was intended to assert more strongly that the same difference in devotedness prevailed between married and unmarried men that existed between married and unmarried women, this does not account for the absence of some connective particle, such as δε, corresponding with the English also, which seems to be required between paragraphs in such a relation as that in which verses 32 and 33 would stand to verse 34. The absence of any such particle, so far as it can exercise any influence, tends to separate the 34th verse from its immediately preceding one, and to leave it open to an equally close connection with any part of the preceding context to which it may seem to apply, or else to make that verse the enunciator of something more or less differing in import or degree of meaning from what immediately goes before.

In the opening of the chapter we are told that the Corinthian converts had consulted the Apostle, and infer that he is giving them his advice or his instructions, as the case may demand, upon the several points of inquiry. After having given some counsel to married people, and especially noticed those who had unbelieving partners, he concludes his observations upon these and some other topics relating to their position in life, with the exhortation, or rather injunction, 'Brethren, let every man wherein he is called therein, abide with God.' He then says, 'Now concerning virgins I have no commandment of the Lord, yet I give my judgment as one that hath obtained mercy of the Lord to be faithful. I suppose therefore that this is good for the present distress, I say, that it is good for a man so to be.' It is hard to say to what the particle οὕτως, so or thus, applies. The instances in which it refers to what follows are rare, and even if this was admitted to be the possible connection in the present case, there is nothing in what follows to justify the sup-

position, for it would introduce into the inquiry whether it were best for a man to remain single, a man already married as a party interested in the inquiry, which he could not be. It is much more in accordance with the use of the word *οὗτος*, and with the sense of the context, to refer it to something preceding, and this we consequently find done by many who interpret the word *παρθένων*, virgins, i. e. unmarried persons of either sex, and who explain the word *οὗτος* thus, that is single. But why if this was the case, and St. Paul spoke either to unmarried men or unmarried women generally, or to both, should he express himself so restrictively and specially, and say it is better for a man to be so? There is, moreover, a defectiveness in the expression, 'it is good for a man so to be,' as a complement to 'Now concerning virgins,' to signify; 'but as to unmarried persons . . . I think it better for them to remain single.' To the Corinthians, who knew the nature of the inquiry which they had made, and which the Apostle here answers, the *οὗτος* conveyed a full and perfect meaning, and no doubt it refers to that inquiry which the Apostle, as it was well known to those whom he addresses, briefly designates as the question *περὶ παρθένων*, all the particulars of which were familiar to them, and to which therefore the *οὗτος* was a satisfactory answer.

Premising this, it is natural to conclude, from the language used, that they had consulted him respecting matrimony, and its duties and alternatives. All the latter the Apostle notices, the one which rendered matrimony in some cases a duty in the second verse, and the case of unmarried and widowed persons in the eighth; and having spoken of these, it might seem that he had exhausted the subject. But there is another point of view in which the alternative of the married state is to be regarded that seems not to have received due weight, if it has not altogether escaped notice—and that is, the circumstances in which the woman is an help meet for the man.

Owing to the 'present necessity,' that is, to the perilous position in which the disciples of Christ stood in that day, and that they might be more devoted to, and less tempted to deny Christ in times of persecution, many might prefer to forego a married life, and to relinquish all prospect of the exercise of the domestic affections. But what, under these circumstances, were unmarried men or widowers to do to supply the want of a wife in that department which is peculiarly the woman's—the management of their domestic concerns, and the care and supervision of their household and property, while they were engaged in the duties of their calling in the field or the city? And what were unmarried women, who had survived their parents, and widows to do for a protector, if they decided upon not taking a partner under the influence of the same

same considerations? Here there is a very large class, embracing all unmarried persons of both sexes, whose parents were deceased or could not support and retain them under the parental roof, and all widows and widowers, who, in the event of their choosing to remain unmarried that they might be more devoted to Christ, and have fewer elements of suffering in case of persecution, would be placed in circumstances of very great difficulty and discomfort. With the degree of refinement and the division of labour, which has been reached in the present day in highly civilized countries, this is a difficulty that cannot be appreciated by the higher or middle classes; but those who have had opportunities of observing the circumstances of the lower orders, particularly in the country, know that it is a very serious one; and that, in the case of widowers especially with young families, it almost necessitates marriage, and is often pleaded as the reason for entering a second time upon the married state at periods which, to those who know not their circumstances, seem indecorously brief. How much greater must the difficulty have been in a comparatively simple state of society like that of the Corinthian converts.

This, then, I believe to be the largely extended and important class which the Apostle has in view; and that the question under consideration was the propriety and greater eligibility, under the circumstances of the church at that time, of a man's having an unmarried woman to manage his domestic matters, to his entering upon the married state. Our Saviour's words respecting times of tribulation were, 'Woe to them that are with child, and to them that give suck in those days.' And the Apostle in the present passage says of those who should marry, that such 'Shall have trouble in the flesh.' By so doing, both man and woman exposed themselves to a multiplication of their dangers and sufferings in the persons of those who would be dear to them as their own lives. While single, each presented but one head for the stroke and one heart to be pierced; but in marrying, they, as it were, became endued with many lives, and subjected themselves to multiplied miseries. For these reasons it was best for them to remain single. But they were not, on the same account, to neglect the duties of their vocation; on the contrary, though the Apostle advises them strongly against changing a single for a married life, he imperatively declares, that 'He that would not work should not eat;' and urges them to be not slothful in business, as well as to be fervent in spirit. The question of marriage was left open, but that of diligence and industry was not; and, that he might carry on the concerns and pursue the business of life efficiently, a domestic manager and superintendent was necessary for the man; and that she might be actively engaged, such duties were necessary for the woman.

The relinquishing the matrimonial connection did not destroy the relative position in which the man stood to the woman as her protector and the provider for her wants; nor of the woman to the man as the proper superintendent and manager of his domestic affairs.

It remains to be seen how the supposition, that this was the difficulty, respecting which they had consulted the Apostle, and which he meets in this part of his reply, will agree with the language, and how far it will afford an easy and obvious reconciliation of the apparently contradictory expressions which have been noticed.

It is quite consistent with the first allusion to the subject in the 25th verse. Now, concerning virgins—that is; according to the view proposed, about persons of this class to manage your domestic concerns, &c., I think that this is good, or a good arrangement, on account of the present or impending necessity, that it is good for a man to be so; or that it should be thus, *i. e.*, that there should be such an arrangement. Not that, with the view of entering upon it, a man who is already married should dissolve his connection; on the contrary, ‘art thou bound to a wife, seek not to be loosed; art thou loosed or free from a wife,’ and the consequent cares and perils and exposure to multiplied sorrows, ‘seek not a wife.’ Nor do I approve of or advise this system with a view of precluding either party at any time from changing their state of life; or that this plan—adopted for mutual convenience and to obviate, as far as domestic superintendence and management are concerned, the necessity for marriage—should be considered a final and irreversible association, and a bar to the marriage of either party. Even after the adoption of such an arrangement both parties continue as much at liberty as ever; and ‘If thou’ (that is, the man) ‘marry, thou hast not sinned; and if the virgin marry, she hath not sinned. Nevertheless such shall have trouble in the flesh in their family ties and affections. But I spare you. I do not wish to press too urgently upon you the abandonment of these ties. But I would have you without carefulness. He that is unmarried careth for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please the Lord; but he that is married careth for the things that are of the world, how he may please his wife.’ There is a difference between a wife and a virgin. ‘The unmarried woman careth for the things of the Lord, that she may be holy, both in body and in spirit; but she that is married careth for the things of the world, that she may please her husband. And this I speak for your own profit, not that I may cast a snare upon you,’ (which I would do if, in recommending such an arrangement, I did not make it entirely optional, and
leave

leave it open to you at any future time to marry,) 'but for that which is comely, and that ye may attend upon the Lord without distraction;' that is to say, that ye may be exempt from the inquietudes and cares of the married state in these troublous times, without forfeiting at the same time the decencies of human life by being deprived of the assistance of woman in the care and management of your domestic affairs. There is, however, one consideration to be kept in view, and some circumstances which call for special notice: 'If any man thinks to behave himself unseemly'—that is, that he will do so, or is in danger of behaving himself unseemly to his virgin or the unmarried person who superintends his household—'if she should pass the flower of her age'—*i. e.* by wishing to marry after having retained her and availed himself of her services till she had passed the flower of her age, and would therefore be unlikely to form a desirable alliance and to secure a home for life, 'and need so require, let him do what he will, he sinneth not.' Let them marry, *i. e.* when they respectively find proper opportunities: Let her marry while her youth and attractions are likely to lead to a suitable alliance, and to the securing a permanent home; and let him by marrying secure one who may take her place in the care of his household matters. Nevertheless, he that standeth steadfast in his heart, having no necessity, but hath power over his own will, and hath decreed this in his heart for the sake of retaining his virgin, doeth well. So, then, he that giveth her in marriage doeth well; but he that giveth her not in marriage, or, according to the reading adopted by Griesbach, he that marrieth not, doeth better.

To sum up what has been said respecting the agreement of this hypothesis with the text, it may be observed that it renders the transition from the expression, 'Now, concerning virgins,' to 'it is a good thing for a man that it should be thus easy and natural,'—it explains the recurrence in the 28th verse to the simple question of marriage, already settled in the beginning of the chapter, by making it to signify not merely that marriage is not sinful, but that it is still open to those who may have chosen a celibate life and been associated under the same roof for the sake of mutual convenience and comfort, or of discharging the several duties which belong to a man and a woman respectively, in the providing for and managing a household—it gives to the word *μεμέρισται*, and to the absence of any connective particle between it and what precedes its appropriate emphasis, and to the use of the word *παρθένος* in opposition to *γυνή* in the 34th verse, a peculiar force and delicacy as significant of the purity of mind and purpose which must be the first requisite in every case in which an unmarried life is chosen, and it shows the ground of the

Apostle's

Apostle's using so strong an expression as *βρόχον ἐπιβάλλω*, cast a snare upon you. It also affords a reasonable and natural explanation of the sense of the phrase, 'behave unseemly to his virgin'; namely, that it is expressive of the injustice and unbecomingness of retaining an unmarried woman, and leading her to think that she would always possess a home with him whose domestic concerns she superintended until she was past that time of life in which the opportunities of a suitable settlement in life were likely to present themselves, and then, from not possessing sufficient control over his inclinations, bringing in a wife and subjecting the unmarried person to the consequent change of position in which she would stand if she remained, or to the necessity of seeking a precarious home and subsistence if she departed. It is supported, moreover, by the natural interpretation of *ἀσχημονεῖν νομιζέει* and *ἐάν ᾗ*, both of which seem to point to something future, and which therefore harmonise with a future course or change of conduct—it gives to the terms in the 37th verse their due significance, while it divests them of all appearance of harshness by making them refer to a person's decision respecting their own life and not that of another—it preserves the power of the idiom, *τοῦ τηρεῖν*, by representing the decision as one come to earlier than would have been otherwise necessary, *for the sake* of its connection with the question of keeping the virgin or giving her in marriage, which justice to her would not allow to be deferred—and, lastly, it explains the use of the word *ἐγκαμιζών* in the 38th verse, or, if we adopt Griesbach's reading of *ἐγκαμιζων* in the beginning, and *γαμιζων* in the end of that verse. For, if a man was not fully decided to remain unmarried, he would do well to give the unmarried person in marriage; but even after that he might himself remain single, and in doing so would do better than if he married, and it might justly be said, 'So then, he that giveth her in marriage doeth well, but he that, after doing this, marrieth not, as well as he who decided not to marry and retaineth her, doeth better.'

In many cases the virgin or unmarried person selected would be a relative; but while the interpretation here proposed does not exclude the case of an unmarried daughter or ward, it includes those who had no suitable relative, and differs *in toto* from the interpretation which confines it to the former, in its explanation of the 37th verse, by applying the terms *ἐξουῖος*, &c. in a very different and much more justifiable way than that which would make the decision whether the virgin should or should not marry to depend, not upon her own choice, will, or purpose, but upon that of her guardian, relative, or friend, and that would thus authorize a forced celibacy in contradiction to the whole train of the Apostle's

Apostle's teaching, and to the express assertion, that if a virgin marry she hath not sinned.

The records of the early church furnish no slight confirmation of the view here proposed. From them we ascertain that those persons who aspired to greater degrees of devotedness to Christ, and to an eminence in holiness, charity, and self-denial, who were often distinguished by the name *Ἀσκηταί*, or ascetics, and specially the widows and virgins of the church, and all of either sex who confined themselves to a single life, and who were ranked in this class of ascetics, did not in the earliest ages withdraw themselves from the active duties of life and form themselves into separate communities either as monks or nuns, but that they continued to be members of individual households, to occupy their stations in the world, and to pursue the labours of their calling. Thus we are told of Marcian, that, before he fell into heresy, he led a celibate life in his father's house;^a and, even after monasteries sprang up, we not only find that many who had chosen celibacy adhered to the earlier custom of remaining in the households of their friends, but that the difference gave rise to a distinction in name, and that those unmarried females who remained in the households of their friends were called ecclesiastical^b and sometimes canonical^c virgins, in contradistinction to those who embraced the less primitive custom of a monastic life.

There are other indications of such a state of things, and of such a practice as would explain the words of the Apostle, and also traces of its corruption. So long as the perils and troubles which the Apostle designates as the present necessity continued, and men carried, as it were, their life in their hand, celibacy would be chosen upon proper grounds; but in proportion as the times became more settled, and Christians were less exposed to peril and suffering, the grounds which the Apostle assigned for foregoing the married state would be removed, and the celibate life, if it continued to prevail, would be chosen on less urgent grounds and under the influence, in many if not in most cases, of very different feelings from those which existed in the times when St. Paul addressed his Epistle to the Corinthians. Hence it would be proportionably liable to abuse, to undue exaltation, to its being chosen upon false principles, without a full consideration of its inconveniences, or regard for the spiritual danger which it involved, or perhaps even with a greater desire to make it subservient to the purposes of self-glory, or to some other equally or more culpable principles, than to a greater devotedness to the cause of Christ. These abuses would naturally lead to appro

^a Epiph. *Hæres.* 42. n. 1.

^b Sozomen, *lib.* viii. c. xxiii.

^c Socrat., *lib.* i. c. xvii.

priate remedies, and to the censure of the evils associated with it, if not to the discontinuance of the practice itself. Such we find to have been the case with some other undoubtedly primitive practices of a similar character, as being liable to similar abuses, owing to the comparative cessation of those perils and distresses which tended to keep the Christian graces in vigorous exercise. The feasts of charity and kiss of peace were of this kind, both of which were discontinued because the circumstances no longer existed which rendered them not only appropriate but comparatively exempt from the risk of abuse.

Upon investigation, this train of argument is strongly supported by the testimony of antiquity, which speaks of a class of persons called *Agapetæ*, *Συνεισάκτοι*, or Sub-introductæ, and *Extraneæ*, that is, unmarried females who were not the relatives of those who entertained them, and who were generally some of the virgins belonging to the church. The Council of Nice prohibits a bishop, presbyter, deacon, or any other clerical person from having these in their houses, and restricts them to their female relatives as residents in their domiciles.

These remarks have extended to a greater length than was proposed; but I may be permitted to conclude them by noticing the view which was entertained of the obligation of these virgins to continue unmarried. The Council of Ancyra assigned a lengthened penance to those who having promised to continue single, broke their promise by marrying, and gradually the rules against them were made more severe; but in the earlier and purer ages it was not so, and St. Cyprian's words seem clearly to prove that their change of purpose was not deemed criminal, nor worthy of ecclesiastical censure in his day. 'If they have,' he says, 'of faith devoted themselves to Christ, let them persevere. . . . But if they are unwilling to continue, or cannot, it is better that they marry.'^d It is scarcely necessary to point out how closely this corresponds with and is capable of explaining the apostle's words, 'But and if thou (*i. e.* a man) who hadst purposed a single life marry, thou hast not sinned; and if a virgin (that is one who had purposed to continue such) marry, she hath not sinned.'

R. K.

^d Cypr. Ep. lxii. al. iv. ad Pompon.

OUR LORD'S DISCOURSES AND SAYINGS.

Discourses and Sayings of our Lord Jesus Christ, illustrated in a Series of Expositions. By JOHN BROWN, D.D., Edinburgh. In three volumes, 8vo. Edinburgh: W. Oliphant and Sons. 1850.

THE records of our Saviour's history by the four Evangelists have engaged a vast amount of authorship. We have commentaries on the Gospels generally, treatises on the separate narratives, especially that of John, on the parables, miracles, sermon on the mount, and valedictory discourse; and an admirable volume, consisting of essays on the characteristics of our Lord's ministry, was recently published by Dr. Harris. But an examination, in detail, of the discourses of the Great Teacher was still a desideratum, which is now well supplied by Dr. Brown. And yet the reader will perhaps be disappointed to find that this work, extending to three large octavo volumes, embraces only the principal discourses—the parables, and very many of the sayings of our Lord, being omitted. We gratefully accept the boon as it is: it will be admitted, by every competent and candid critic, to be a contribution of great value to our sacred literature. Those who are acquainted with the author's *Expository Discourses on First Peter*, formerly noticed in this Journal, will have their expectations fully realised, we doubt not surpassed, by the new work.

The first volume is mainly occupied with the sermon on the mount, and the third is wholly devoted to the valedictory discourse; while the second embraces a number of miscellaneous discourses, selected chiefly from John's Gospel, chapters vii., viii., x., xii., xiii. The other subjects of the first volume are John iii. 14-21; iv. 4-42; v. 17-47; Luke xi. 37-54; xii. 49, 50; John vi.: and of the second, Matt. xv. 1-20; but the additional matter in the parallel passages of the other evangelists is, in each case, embraced.

Of Dr. Brown's high qualification as an expounder of Holy Writ, we have already recorded our opinion. The religious press universally pronounced its high estimate of his work on First Peter, which was confirmed by the Christian public in the speedy demand for a second edition of a large and expensive work. The author's expositions are a model for the Christian pastor, as nearly perfect as possible. Here we have sacred hermeneutics developed and applied in a manner the most satisfactory.

No

No difficulty of any importance is evaded, and some portion of light is thrown on all. Where several conflicting opinions of the learned are detailed, his discrimination is admirable; when his own interpretation is given, it is set forth with so much clearness, and appears so reasonable, that the reader will seldom feel disposed to withhold his assent. As an able expositor—clear, candid, comprehensive—Dr. Brown is unrivalled among British divines: there is in his pages a hallowed combination of learning and piety.

His present subject is one of the highest importance—the discourses of him who spake as never man spake. It is justly remarked by him, in his preface, that—

‘there is comparatively little, if anything, in the apostolical epistles, of which the germ is not to be found in the gospels. The declarations of the apostles are but the development of their Master’s thoughts—a commentary, an infallible one, on his sayings; and we do not rightly estimate these divine writings, if we do not consider them as a part of *his* word; nor rightly use them, if we do not employ them for the purpose of better understanding *his* mind and heart, and so bringing our minds and hearts into conformity with his.’

Additional observations on the same point occur in the body of the work:—

‘The inferiority of the epistles to the gospels in the New Testament, as to authority and importance, is a favourite dogma of those who have assumed to themselves the distinctive appellation of rational Christians; and “Not Paul but Jesus,” or “Jesus and not Paul,” is the quaint title of a very weak book by a very able man in support of this dogma. The professed object of the book is to demolish the authority of the apostles in order to establish the authority of their Master. The author would have us seek our religion exclusively in the gospels. According to him, the sayings of Jesus, as recorded there, are divine oracles; the writings of the apostles are only human, and sometimes mistaken, commentaries on these oracles.

‘The distinction thus attempted to be established, as to the origin and authority of the two constituent portions of the New Testament, the gospels and the epistles, is utterly unfounded. The authority of Christ and his apostles must stand or fall together. The doctrine taught by the apostles in the epistles is not “diverse” from that taught by their Master in the gospels: it is substantially the same. All the doctrines of Christianity, as taught by the apostles, even those of them most unpalatable to self-called rational Christians—such as the trinal distinction in the one divine nature, the true divinity of the Son, the distinct personality and divinity of the Holy Spirit, redemption through substitutionary and expiatory suffering, justification by faith of the truth, transformation of character through divine influence, the resurrection of the body—all these doctrines in their *elementary* Lord’s discourses.’—vol. iii. p. 219.

The

The work appears, not in the form of continuous comment on the sections of the gospels brought under review, but in the shape of discourses almost as read from the professor's chair and the pulpit. This accounts for various allusions to the Lord's Supper, according as a discourse was delivered immediately before or after the periodic observance of the ordinance. These allusions, however, form no essential part of the expositions, and might with propriety have been omitted in the publication. With this trifling exception the discourses are strictly expository.

The text or paragraph of each exposition is divided according to the subjects contained in it. The analysis of some of the longer passages, as the sermon on the mount and the valedictory discourse, throws much light on them, in some instances anticipating the author's interpretation. Take, for example, John xiv. 12-14, which is thus divided: '1. The privileges to be enjoyed by the apostles after their Lord's return to the Father—(1) they shall continue to work miracles; (2) they shall do greater things than the working of miracles. 2. Manner in which these privileges were to be obtained.' And, in the body of the exposition, the reader finds a number of opinions stated regarding the word translated 'greater,' after which the author adds,—

'I apprehend that there is no reference to miracles, properly so called, in this case, but to something which our Lord means to contrast as to magnitude and importance with the miracles, both of himself and of the apostles—the preaching of a clear, full revelation of the economy of mercy to a lost world, the turning even a single soul, far more an innumerable multitude of souls, "from darkness to light," &c.'

There are many truly noble discourses in these volumes. We may specify those in vol. i. pp. 347-358; 471-548; ii. pp. 21-46; 145-167; 266-285; 286-353: this last embraces a full treatise on the *Death of Christ and its Results*, and we may hint that the author would perform a good service by permitting its separate publication. More than one of these single discourses might be selected which would of itself have established the reputation of any man who might have published it.

We proceed to indicate a few of the texts of which the author's opinion is different from the common one, and to give an extract or two, premising that there are many passages more interesting and important than those we select, but their length renders them unsuitable for being extracted. There is much independent thought throughout the work—the author carefully weighs the opinions of others, but thinks for himself. Instances of this are of constant occurrence. On John iii. 16, he notices the opinion that the term 'world' is descriptive, 'not of mankind generally,
but

but of the whole of a particular class, that portion of mankind who, according to the divine purpose of mercy, shall ultimately become partakers of the salvation of Christ.' He very properly contends that the reference is 'to sinners indiscriminately,' remarking, that 'not merely was the atonement offered by Jesus Christ sufficient for the salvation of the whole world, but it was intended and fitted to remove out of the way of the salvation of sinners generally, every bar which the perfections of the divine moral character, and the principles of the divine moral government, presented;' and 'in consequence of that atonement, every sinner may be, and if he believe in Jesus certainly shall be, pardoned and saved.' On John x. 26, he says: 'Some excellent divines, though, in this instance, not very accurate interpreters, considering "the sheep" and "the elect" as not only descriptions of the same persons, but as synonymous terms, have supposed that our Lord's statement is, "Ye do not believe, because ye are not among the elect:"' and after some excellent observations on election, he adds, that these very persons, here said to be not of the sheep, 'may yet, in believing the truth, by their calling, make their election evident;' and 'in no case is it *non-election* which is the cause of men's unbelief.' On John v. 26, he says, that most interpreters have considered these words 'as expressive of what they have termed that eternal communication of the divine nature, which they consider as implied in the very nature of our Lord's sonship. I cannot find in the Scriptures any sanction to this language. I can attach no distinct idea to it: it seems to me a contradiction in terms. I know very good divines have spoken of the Father as the fountain of Deity; but, in doing so, they have, I apprehend, "darkened counsel by words without knowledge." A derived independent existence, a communicated original power, are certainly downright absurdities.' His own interpretation is, that 'the Father, as the head of the mediatorial economy, appoints the Son to hold and exercise that independent power of conferring life, which is the characteristic property of that divinity, of which they are equally possessed. He constitutes him the fountain of divine life to mankind, because he is in himself adequate to this function.' We must refer to the work itself for the more minute criticism by which that interpretation is justified.

Our author discovers a closer connection between the various sections of the sermon on the mount than most interpreters have found. On the saying in Matt. v. 20, he makes the following excellent observations:—

'These words in the 20th verse are not only deserving of our most considerate attention, as embodying a most important practical truth,
but

but as being, so to speak, the text of a large portion of the remainder of the discourse, occupied in illustrating, by examples, how the righteousness of the citizens of the kingdom of heaven was to exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees.

'To understand a discourse nothing is of greater importance than a clear apprehension of its object and design. If this be not distinctly understood, the most perspicuous statements may appear obscure, the most conclusive arguments unsatisfactory, and the most apposite illustrations irrelevant. A great deal of the obscurity, which in most men's minds rests on very many passages of the Holy Scriptures, is to be accounted for on this principle. They do not distinctly perceive, or they altogether misapprehend, the object of the inspired writer; and while they do, it would be wonderful if they should clearly understand his particular statements, arguments, and illustrations. The object of the inspired writers in any particular part of their writings may generally, without much difficulty, be discovered, and when it is found out, it is the best key for unlocking the treasures of wisdom and knowledge therein contained. It is often distinctly stated in so many words, and when it is not so, it may usually, by a heedful perusal of the context, be satisfactorily ascertained. I apprehend a good deal of misinterpretation has prevailed in reference to that paragraph of our Lord's sermon on the mount, in the exposition of which we are about to engage, in consequence of mistakes as to its object or design. . . .

'The object of our Lord seems to us very distinctly and clearly stated by himself in the 20th verse. That object was to show that the system of religious and moral duty, which was to be taught and exemplified in the "kingdom of God," the new economy, was to be greatly superior to that system of religious and moral duty taught by the Scribes and exemplified by the Pharisees; and, as the system of duty taught by the Scribes and Pharisees was generally accounted by the Jews the right one, that object was further to impress on their minds the great truth which the whole discourse seems to be intended to illustrate and enforce, that they must "repent," change their minds, now that "the kingdom of God was at hand;" for unless they, by this change of mind, were "born again," they could not "see it," nor "enter into it;" they could not understand its nature, nor enjoy its blessings. All that follows, from the 20th verse down to the 18th verse of the next chapter, is an illustration by example of the principle here stated. Our Lord's object, then, is not to contrast the true meaning of the ten commandments with the limited signification ascribed to them by the Jewish teachers; still less is it to contrast the morality of the law with the morality of the Gospel; but it is to contrast the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees with the righteousness of the kingdom of God; that is, the system of religious and moral duty taught by the Scribes and exemplified by the Pharisees with the system of religious and moral duty to be taught and exemplified by the true followers of Messiah the Prince.'—vol. i. pp. 203-206.

Dr. Brown dissents from the opinion that our Lord dissuades from going into law-courts, in Matt. v. 25, and understands him 'to

'to urge the duty of being immediately reconciled to the brother whom we have injured, lest, dying under the guilt which unrepented of and unrepaired injuries to our brother necessarily involve, we should be plunged into hopeless destruction.' The strong tendency on the part of many preachers, and some writers, greatly to multiply the types of Scripture, and to search for analogies in real types which were never intended, has a most pernicious influence on the cause of sound Biblical interpretation. Our author specifies a few out of the many correspondences which fancy has discovered between the manna (John vi.) and our Lord; and he administers a well-merited rebuke to those who indulge in such imaginings. It 'appears to me,' says he, 'something worse than ingenious trifling. It is using a most undue freedom with him who says, "Add not to my words;" and its tendency is to lead the mind away from the truth which the Holy Spirit does mean to teach us, and which is always, when clearly perceived, and rightly improved, "profitable for doctrine and reproof, and correction, and instruction in righteousness," to the mere figment of the human imagination.' Dr. Brown's own specimens of accurate exegesis will do much to correct the evil complained of.

Every enlightened believer in the Christian religion has often been cheered by the Saviour's assurance, 'Him that cometh unto me I will in no wise cast out' (John vi. 37); but the previous clause appears less inviting. Our author's view of that clause is slightly different from the common one, and presents in an interesting light the truth contained in it. 'The being given to Christ by the Father (says he) seems to be the same thing as what, in the 44th verse, is called the being "drawn," or conducted to him by the Father; and that is represented in the 45th verse, as equivalent to the being so "taught of God," "hearing and learning of the Father," as that they come to him. Men are given by God to Christ, when they are brought to him, united to him by that faith which is the gift of God,—when, under the influence of his Spirit, they are made to come to him—that is, are led in the belief of the truth, to exercise towards the Saviour all those sentiments of mind and heart which correspond to the different views given in the Gospel, of his person and work.' Coming to Christ, and believing on him, are not synonymous phrases, though often said to be so; and the distinction is well pointed out in a few words by our author. 'It is by believing the truth about Christ that we are enabled to come to him. Coming to Christ, then, is just a figurative expression for those exercises of the mind and heart in reference to him, which naturally rise out of the belief of the truth respecting him, the movement of the thoughts and affections towards him' (vol. ii. p. 29). In volume ii. pp. 223-226 the doctrine

trine of the perseverance of the saints is maintained and defended against those errors by which it has been encumbered and brought into disrepute. When our Lord spoke of his death and burial as necessary to secure a multitude of followers, having a spiritual resemblance to him, he employed a figurative illustration, of which a peculiar explanation is here given—'Except a corn of wheat, falling into the ground, be dead, it abideth alone' (John xii. 24)—understanding the fact referred to as 'what takes place, not after, but before, putting the seed into the ground.' The author says, quite decidedly, that 'the figure is generally misapprehended,' both here and in 1 Cor. xv. 36, but it may be fairly questioned whether the common explanation be not equally true to nature, and in accordance with the original.

On the importance of acquiring an acquaintance with the letter of the Holy Scripture, we have the following well-weighed words:—

'It is not the knowledge which is eternal life, but it is the basis of that knowledge. Where the first is wanting, the second cannot exist. It is the instrument which the Holy Spirit employs in bringing men to that understanding and faith of divine truth which are able to save the soul. He who is acquainted, it may be well acquainted, with the Scriptures, literally, *may be*, notwithstanding, altogether ignorant of them spiritually; but he who is ignorant of them literally *cannot be* at all acquainted with them spiritually.

'This literal kind of acquaintance with the Scriptures is eagerly to be sought, but it is not to be rested in. It is a means, not an end.'—vol. ii. p. 354.

Some of the Psalms which can be proved to be Messianic make distinct mention of the sin of the sufferer. This presents an apparently insuperable difficulty in the way of their application to the sinless Redeemer. Dr. Brown vindicates the interpretation whereby this is accounted for on the principle of imputed sin. 'The difficulty,' says he, 'seems removed by the undoubtedly true principle—the principle which, above all others, gives Christianity its peculiar character: "He who knew no sin was made sin."'

In the valedictory discourse, which is by far the most interesting volume of the three, the author admirably follows out his plan—of considering, in succession, how these sayings of our Lord bore on the peculiar circumstances of the disciples, and how they are related to us. Regarding the commencing words—'Let not your heart be troubled'—as the text of this discourse, he discovers a connected train of thought throughout the whole. John (xiv. 26) seems naturally to close the valedictory discourse, but the speaker resumes in the following verse, by repeating the opening exhortation—

tion—'Let not your heart be troubled.' On this our author has a fine remark :—

'This seems the natural close of the discourse—the Farewell. But our Lord appears loth to leave his disciples, especially to leave them so sad. There are two or three places in these discourses where you would expect the close, but he still goes on. His kind heart will not allow him to part with them thus. It puts us in mind of the exquisitely beautiful lines of the Roman Poet :—

'Ter limen tetigi, ter sum revocatus, et ipse
Indulgens animo, pes mihi tardus erat.
Sæpe VALE dicto rursus sum multa locutus,
Et quasi discedens oscula summa dedi.'

The reader will, perhaps, be surprised to find (vol. iii. p. 558) an ingenious, and on the whole satisfactory, vindication of the conduct of the disciples, usually condemned, when they forsook their Master and fled. The author has too earnest a desire to discover and exhibit the mind of the Spirit to permit himself to be fettered, even by the standards of the church of which he is a minister. By the Catechism published by his grandfather, the venerable John Brown of Haddington, even the youth of Scotland are familiar with the expression, 'It is the personal property of the Holy Ghost to proceed from the Father and the Son.' This point came in this way in John xv. 26, and he justly remarks, that it seems 'most natural to interpret the expression, "the Spirit's proceeding from the Father," in the same way as the completely parallel expression used by our Lord himself at the 28th verse of the following chapter—"I am come from the Father, and am come into the world;" and there can be no doubt that, when the river of water of life—the emblem of the Holy Spirit—is said to "proceed out of the throne of God and of the Lamb" (Rev. xxii. 1), the reference is to economical arrangement.'

From the specimens we have given, perhaps, some readers, unacquainted with the work, may suppose that the author makes it a principle with him to differ from the common view, where he can with any plausibility. No conclusion could be more unjust. There is abundant evidence that his own prefatory statement is true—'I have always felt more satisfied when I found myself, as I have usually done, following in the track of the learned and pious of former generations, than when compelled, as I have sometimes been, to walk alone.' His clear and penetrating mind readily perceives the meaning and connection of a text, and he hesitates not to declare it, whether in company or alone. This gives great value to his work, as an original and exhaustive commentary.

There are a few minor things to which we might take exception,
but

but they are of small importance. The word rendered 'to condemn,' in John iii. 17, is here rendered *to punish*; an interpretation in which we cannot follow the venerable author. He has evidently been led to adopt it from the antithesis of this word to 'save;' but it does not suit well in the other verses of the same passage, and it is evidently not a fixed view with him, for we afterwards find the following sentence, embracing the common interpretation, in a different connection:—'It were strange, indeed, if he "who came to condemn the world," should have in these words, if they bear the sense which has been, by a mistaken interpretation, imposed on them, anticipated, as to these individuals, the final condemnatory sentence of the judgment day' (vol. ii. p. 217). In John (v. 39) he understands the word 'search' interrogatively, but the meaning is much better brought out by those who understand it indicatively. When our Lord's sufferings are spoken of as a baptism, he understands this to refer to their *nature and origin*, as well as *severity*, and illustrates these three ideas—is not this making too much of the comparison, severity being the only idea apparently intended? In John (x. 10) believers are said to have life through Christ *more abundantly*, but he gives it 'in abundance—not only life but *royal* life.' We prefer to understand it as the good Matthew Henry has expressed it—'that they might have a life *more abundant* than that which was lost and forfeited by sin.' In John (viii. 44) it is said that the devil *abode* not in the truth, for there *is* no truth in him; but without (as we think) good reason, he renders it *abides* not in the truth.

The volumes are beautifully printed, and with considerable accuracy, but we have observed a few errata which will probably be corrected in a second edition. The indexes are full, and prepared with much care.

We conclude by expressing our fervent wish that the venerable author may be spared to give to the Christian public several similar works of equal dimensions and excellence. It is in the department of exposition that he is pre-eminent, and his two large contributions have created an earnest desire for more.

P. M.

ANNOTATIONS ON THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Additional Annotations, Critical, Philological, and Explanatory, on the New Testament; being a Supplemental Volume to the Greek Testament, with English Notes, in two volumes. By the Rev. S. T. BLOOMFIELD, D.D., of Cambridge and Oxford, and Vicar of Bisbrook, Rutland. London. Longmans, 1850. 1 vol. 8vo. Pp. 448.

THIS volume may be briefly described to the many who are familiar with Dr. Bloomfield's Greek Testament, as being executed on almost entirely the same plan as that work. There is the same diligence in recording the opinions of others, as found scattered through a variety of sources of information, the same marked preference for the judgment of Calvin as an expositor (even while on several points differing from him as to his doctrinal system), and the same attachment to the readings of the modern copies of the Greek New Testament, rather than those found in the most ancient MSS. and versions. In fact, the same class of students who have profitably used the repeated editions of Dr. Bloomfield's Greek Testament, will find this supplementary volume in precise accordance with the author's plan.

In 1839 Dr. Bloomfield spoke (in the preface to his stereotyped edition of the Greek Testament) of his intention to collect materials for a supplementary volume. He then appeared to think that it would be one of considerable size, and that it would comprise a large part of the contents of his '*Recensio Synoptica Annotationis Sacre*.' In both these respects, however, Dr. Bloomfield appears in the course of twelve years to have in some measure changed his plan: in the volume before us, he has *principally* confined himself to the expository works published *since* the appearance of his stereotyped edition; and one of the great objects before his mind has been a continuous defence of the common readings (*i.e.* those of the Stephanic and Elzevir texts) against recent editors such as Lachmann and Tischendorf.

He says of himself, 'This led him to enter more at large into that difficult and perplexing subject,—the *foundation* of the ordinary, and of the Stephanic text of the New Testament' (Pref. p. vi.). We should not have supposed that Dr. Bloomfield could have found difficulty or perplexity in investigating this subject. Erasmus edited his Greek Testament from a few MSS.: his different editions received some alterations from new MSS. which became known to him, and from the Complutensian Polyglott, so that his fifth and last edition became

became substantially the text in common use. Robert Stephens, after having published (in 1546 and 1549) two beautiful small editions, in which the text partly followed the Erasmian and partly the Complutensian, brought out, in 1550, his *third* edition, in folio, which is the one commonly intended when the *Stephanic text* is mentioned: in this he so closely followed Erasmus's fifth edition, that it is said to differ only in twenty readings. Dr. Bloomfield, however, appears to consign the subject to almost hopeless obscurity. He adds a note to the passage just cited, in which he says,

'That Robert Stephens *did* use *several* Greek MSS., and those ancient, for his edition of the Greek Testament, is proved (contrary to the assertions of Porson) by the direct words of his illustrious son Henry, in his *Thesaurus Gr. Ling.* v. ἁλῶν, where he says, "*Vetusta omnia exemplaria, quibus usus est ad edit. N. T. pater meus,—erant autem plus minus quindecim—habebant ἁλῶνα non ἁλῶνα.*" The notice of this very minute discrepancy implies *collation* of the most careful kind. H. Stephens also adverts distinctly to the reading of six of those MSS. in his *Thes.* v. ἀποσκευάζω, and occasionally in other articles.'

Dr. B. does not mention to *what* assertions of Porson he refers. We believe that the fact is fully admitted, that R. Stephens, in his third edition, gives various readings from the Complutensian Polyglott, and from fifteen MSS. containing more or less of the New Testament; but whether his text was based on these collations, or not, is a question wholly distinct; and that it was not so based is shown—1st, from the fact that he simply repeats Erasmus's fifth edition with scarcely a variation; and 2nd, that he often cites *all* his collated MSS. for a reading not in his text. It is thus wholly fallacious to connect his *collations* with his text: whatever they might be worth, they were wholly supplemental, so that their age, goodness, or the care with which they were collated, have no relation whatever with the subject of the foundation of the Stephanic text. As to the MSS. used, we know most of them, and can form our own judgments as to their age and value; and as to the care bestowed in collating, we know that the readings are cited with no great exactness, which is shown not only with regard to the MSS., but even as to a printed book, the Complutensian Polyglott.

How much the object of this volume is connected with opposition to the critical texts of Lachmann and Tischendorf is plainly stated in the preface: a great deal of labour, however, would have been (we think) saved if Dr. Bloomfield had clearly stated *what* are the critical principles of Lachmann, *what* those of Tischendorf; if he then had given to the reader his exceptions to the respective principles of these critics, and if he had then plainly laid down his own. We might thus have analyzed, with far more both of accu-

racy and ease, the *continual* remarks which we find in the notes on the subject of readings. Perpetually, after a reading has been mentioned as adopted by Lachmann and Tischendorf, do we find the addition '*but without reason*': this calls for the inquiry, on what principles would it be 'without reason'? Lachmann gives in a few words the *authorities* on which his text is based. It may be a question whether he has or has not acted rightly in the narrow limitation of his authorities; but surely it can hardly be a question whether, *on his own principles* (not on Dr. Bloomfield's), he was not bound to adopt the readings which are supported by *all* his admitted authorities: and yet this is the class of readings to which the remark '*but without reason*' is particularly applied.

The most ancient MSS. are, without exception, stigmatized as '*altered*': this charge is not a little strange; when thus brought against *all*, the very extent of it goes a long way towards disproving it. It would, in our opinion, be a most extraordinary phenomenon, that even if no large MSS. of the most ancient class had come down to us free from alteration, that the palimpsest fragments (such as P, Q, Z,) should be in a similarly altered condition.

An example of Dr. Bloomfield's mode of argument on the subject of readings may be fairly taken from his note on Rom. v. 13.

'The word [ἐλλογεῖται] is so rare, that it has only been found in this and another passage of St. Paul (Philem. 18), and in a Greek inscription occurring in Boeck's *Inscr. Græc.* t. i. p. 850, adduced by me in my *Lex. N. T.* in v. It is remarkable that in this passage, and that of Philem. 18, above noticed, Lachm. and Tisch. should read from a few trivial MSS., ἐλλόγα, and Lachmann place in the margin here ἐλλογᾶται; for there is not the slightest trace of any such verb as ἐλλογᾶω.'

Dr. Bloomfield's reason for rejecting the readings with the verb ἐλλογᾶω strikes us as singular; for there seems just as little trace of the verb ἐλλογέω. Had the Greek inscription in which it has been found not come down to us, then we should have known the word only from its occurrence in St. Paul's epistles, and there merely on the supposition that this is the true reading. Where words of extreme rarity are used, it is wholly fallacious to argue in this manner. Supposing the authorities are of more weight which support ἐλλογᾶω in St. Paul's epistles, we might then, on such principles of criticism, question the reading found in the inscription.

The remarks which are often made on *internal* evidence for or against a reading, frequently rest wholly on the supposition that if an expression be once used, the same expression *precisely* ought to be found again in a similar connection. This is the very mode of criticism adopted by the mass of *correcting copyists*: this was the

the principle on which they brought the gospels into more and more conformity to one another, even before the time of Jerome. This is the very principle which those who have sought to follow ancient authorities of the text of the New Testament have found it most needful to repudiate; they have thus felt bound not to argue from supposed probability or analogy what the Apostles *should* have written, but to learn from *testimony* what they actually *did* write.

We are glad, however, for these subjects to be fairly discussed: every charge of inconsistency brought against critical editors deserves to be fully considered; we must, however, deny most emphatically that there is any inconsistency in following internal evidence, when it leads to the adoption of different phraseology in passages otherwise parallel. To us this part of Dr. Bloomfield's remarks has a decided value: whatever *can* be alleged against modern critical editors is sure to be brought forward; and all that can be urged in favour of the *textus receptus* is sure to be stated.

Dr. Bloomfield sometimes (by mere oversight) quotes incorrectly from both Lachmann and Tischendorf; and this has the effect not only of misrepresenting *their* meaning, but also of causing his own arguments and remarks to be inapposite. Thus, under 1 Cor. xi. 27, he says (after some doctrinal remarks on the words of that verse), '*ἀναξίως* is by Lachm. and Tisch. cancelled, on the authority of MSS. A, B, C, and two late versions, but without any good reason. Internal evidence, indeed, might seem against them; but when properly weighed it is not. Far more probable is it that the word should have been omitted in those three MSS. than that St. Paul should have chosen to leave a sense so essential on an occasion such as the present to be conveyed *per ellipsin*; and to supply, as must be done in order to the making out of any sense suitable to the foregoing context, the word *ἀδοκιμάστως*, would involve an almost unprecedented harshness.' But what is the real reading of Lachmann and Tischendorf? In verse *twenty-seven* they *both* retain *ἀναξίως*, and thus the *harshness*, &c., are wholly imaginary. It is true they *do* omit the word in question in verse *twenty-nine*, but *there* no harshness or ellipsis is involved; the verse means, according to their reading, 'He who eateth and drinketh, not discerning the body, eateth and drinketh judgment unto himself.' On critical principles, who cannot see how easily *ἀναξίως* may have been introduced here in the common text from verse *twenty-seven*? The 'two late versions' of which Bloomfield speaks are the Sahidic and Ethiopic: some will be surprised to see them *thus* designated. We do not at all see the import of the clause, 'Internal evidence, indeed, might seem against them; but when properly weighed it is not.'

We

We must, however, remark that Dr. B. is not always very accurate in his designations of critical authorities; the most ancient and authoritative translations are continually described as inferior versions.

The note given on Rev. xii. 14 is as follows:—

'14. ποιῶντες τὰς ἐντολάς]. MS. A and two others, with the Vulg. and Armenian versions, read πλύνοντας στολὰς [rectè πλύνοντες τὰς στολὰς] αὐτῶν; a very remarkable reading, which arose, I doubt not, from the marginal scholia, and originated in the wish of some biblical student to intimate that "to doing the commandments of God should be united the washing their vestments in the blood of the Lamb," with a reference to what was said, supra i. 8, and vii. 5 [l. 14]. It is remarkable that the reading should have gained admittance into the Vulg. and other versions, inasmuch that the Pesch. Syr. almost *alone* of the ancient versions is free from this corruption of the text by interpolation; for such it is, notwithstanding that Lachmann has most injudiciously received it into the text, as indeed, strange to say, Bentley long ago did.'

The assertion, 'for such it is', is rather strong on a question whether words be genuine or not: an *assertion* of interpolation will not do instead of *proof*;^a and if the theory of Dr. B. were correct, how could we account for the fact that the reading which he rejects is found in the *ancient* authorities, and that which he approves is in the modern? In a question of this kind the ancient versions have a peculiar value; and it is useless to speak of the Peschito Syriac in this passage, for the Revelation is not contained in that version. The Syriac Apocalypse in the Leyden MS. is sufficiently modern, and all tyros in textual criticism know that the *Peschito Syriac* cannot be cited in that book. Dr. Bloomfield may be surprised that Bentley's judgment is contrary to his; but this difference of judgment does not depend on points connected with a single passage, but on the diametrical opposition of his critical principles to those on which that great scholar acted.

Besides Bentley and Lachmann, Dr. Christopher Wordsworth might have been mentioned as one who has edited the reading which Dr. Bloomfield rejects; Dr. B.'s silence is the more remarkable as he commonly refers to Dr. Wordsworth's edition of the Apocalypse. In doing so, however, he is often under a misappre-

^a In other places Dr. B.'s *assertions* as to the readings of MSS. must not be too hastily confided in as certainly correct. Thus, Luke x. 11, he speaks of Griesbach, Lachmann, and Tischendorf having cancelled ἐφ' ὑμᾶς, 'on the authority, as they allege, of MSS. B, D, L,' &c. To this he replies, 'But B (the most ancient of all MSS.) has the words.' We have, however, the joint evidence of two collations (those of Bentley and Bartolucci) that B has *not* the words. So, too, in James i. 3 Dr. B. has just the same inaccuracy when charging Tischendorf with error in citing B for the omission of the words τῆς πίστεως. This is founded on Bentley's collation.

hension, for he not unfrequently censures Dr. Wordsworth for having edited particular readings on (what Dr. B. terms) insufficient authority; while in fact Dr. Wordsworth has not only stated his authorities, but in the margin of each page he has placed, ‘*ex Codicibus Antiquissimis*’; *these* were what he professed to follow.

We may also remark in this place, that it is not a little strange to find no mention or allusion to the critical edition of the Revelation published by Dr. Tregelles, a work of which Dr. Bloomfield could not fail of being informed, since that work as well as its editor are repeatedly mentioned by Dr. Wordsworth.^b

In the passage just given from Dr. B.’s note on Rev. xxii. 14, where the Greek contains two errors, and in several others, it seems as if some other, and not Dr. B. himself, had acted as editor of the volume before us. We say this without possessing any information respecting the work, except that which the volume itself supplies. Thus, there is a strange oversight in Acts xi. 6, where a note on a reading occurs belonging certainly to x. 12, and having no meaning where it is found. It seems as if the hands of others had arranged Dr. B.’s separate notes. The note in question is a good illustration of Dr. B.’s critical principles: the two enumerations, in Acts x. 12, and xi. 6, do not *precisely* agree in the best critical authorities: Dr. B. thinks it more probable that *diversity* should have originated with the scribes, than that they should have introduced uniformity: we *know*, however, that they were prone to the latter.

We have sometimes failed altogether in understanding Dr. Bloomfield’s allusions. Thus, 2 Pet. iii. 10, he says, ‘Throughout this passage St. Peter had in view Judith xvi. 1.’ There is nothing in Judith xvi. 1, which appears to have any connection with the passage; and we think that the improbability is incalculably great that the Apostle referred to an apochryphal book, and that it is not likely that Dr. B. intended this. To what, however, he meant to refer in his note, we do not at all see.

Although a large portion of the notes relate to questions of reading, yet also there are many simply philological and explanatory. In these Dr. B. has not shrunk from the labour of re-examining points on which he had already stated his opinion; and when needful, in his judgment, such opinions are modified, or changed. He has used many works which have appeared since his Greek Testament was stereotyped, such as *Peile* on some of the Epistles, the excellent work of Mr. Green on the Grammar of

^b Had Dr. B. noticed the above-mentioned edition of the Apocalypse, it would have saved him from such mistakes as the assertion, in Rev. xvii. 7, that the reading *ἐπὶ οὐ* ‘has been adopted *solely* by Tischendorf.’

the New Testament, and several others. There are few of these notes which do not deserve an attentive examination.

We are glad that this work has appeared; and as we doubt not that it will be very commonly used by Biblical Students, we do not consider a lengthened notice of other portions of its contents to be needful. We have already indicated the principal points on which we do not agree with the learned author.

In his preface, Dr. Bloomfield speaks of 'certain biblical critics of our own country, whose views, at least as regards the three parallel gospels, are quite inconsistent with the divine inspiration of the revealed word.' We do not find any intimation whatever to whom these remarks apply: we may, however, say, that we can well sympathise with feelings of apprehension when any such theories are brought forward as would peril the inspiration of Scripture. We believe that the true application of sound critical principles will ever be of special value in upholding the real authority of Scripture, an authority which is inseparably connected with the doctrine of inspiration. Whoever the critics may be to whom Dr. Bloomfield refers, we feel confident that if they have advanced such theories, there must be some hopeless fallacy connected with their investigations.

Q. R.

CORRESPONDENCE.

TENSES OF HEBREW VERBS.

SIR,—As these replications may be carried to excess both in length and frequency, I shall endeavour to be as brief and methodical as possible in meeting the objections that have been made to my former communication.

1. I take this opportunity of correcting two errors of the press, which render the meaning of two passages obscure, if not undiscoverable. *Special*, in p. 196, line 33, should be *spacial* or *spatial*: and *part*, in p. 198, line 11, should be *past*. There are two or three other errors, but they will cause no mistake. I have also to request the indulgent reader to omit *on* in several translations of the posterior tense, as it has led Dr. Lee to suppose (p. 206, July, 1850) that I understand by this tense a continuation of an action previously begun; while, in fact, I use the phrase 'I go to do,' or 'I proceed to do,' to express an action, the beginning of which is contiguous to the point of view. In commenting on my statement that the active participles
express

express the central tense, Dr. Lee asks—why have I rejected the passive participles? Here is my answer. If Dr. Lee recognise no relation as a tense but past, present, and future, then to him the participles have no time. But if he acknowledge the distinction of perfect and imperfect, or of anterior, central, and posterior, then I submit that in Lev. xiv. 51, הַצִּיּוֹר הַשְּׁחִינָה means *the bird slain*, not *a-slaying*; and such cases are so frequent, that I must believe the anterior to be the normal tense of the passive participle. Dr. Lee objects to my translation—*And to Adam he has not found*; and substitutes—*And as to Adam, he found not*. Mine is the more literal, and is not more definite than the original; qualities that are desirable in the present case. Having dismissed these details, I come to the main subject of consideration.

2. *Each time-form has only one primary and proper meaning.* This is a first-principle in philosophical investigation. I know no real exception to it. The so-called perfect of the Latin language is, indeed, employed to express the narrative tense as well as the ante-present. But the common consent of grammarians, and the structure of the form itself, *egeram, egi, egero*, prove it to be, primarily and properly, the *præsens perfectum*, or ante-present. This, then, is only an apparent exception to the rule laid down.

3. The two principles of Dr. Lee's system are—1. That the Hebrew tenses are the past and the present; 2. That there is an absolute and a relative use of these tenses. First, then, it is denied that the two Hebrew time-forms are the past and the present. For forms, as well as other things, are to be distinguished in designation, not by what is common to them all, but by what is peculiar to each. But it is common to these two forms to be, both of them, past, or present, or future. They are, therefore, not to be distinguished in designation by past, or present, or future. Dr. Lee will not deny the minor; will he deny the major, or the conclusion?

4. And, secondly, it is denied that there is an absolute and a relative use of either of these two tenses. If the kind and critical reader will cast his eye over the tables in pages 194, 195, of January, 1850, he will be the better able to go along with me in my '*mode of exhibiting my opinions.*' The three horizontal rows in any of these tables represent the three divisions of absolute time; the three columns those of relative time. That is, each of the tenses in the first row is absolutely past; each in the second, absolutely present; each in the third, absolutely future. Again: each of those in the first column is *before* the point of time *referred to*, or the *relative* point of time in view; each in the second is *at*, and each in the third is *after* this point. Now, while there is obviously here an absolute and a relative division of tenses, there is not an absolute and a relative use of any tense. Each tense has one use, which includes, in Latin and Greek, both relations of time, as expressed in their names, *præteritum perfectum*, *præt. imperfectum*, *præsens perf.*, *præsens imperf.*, &c. This is a presumptive argument against such a double use in Hebrew. But will Dr. Lee have recourse to the *præsens perfectum* of Latin, as an analogy
for

which convey a correct impression of their real nature according to the current usage of grammarians? Is it just to me, which is a small matter, or to truth, which is all important, to persist in using in a new sense terms which have been in all correct grammars appropriated to essentially different ideas, when there are actually terms which have been uniformly applied to the precise ideas intended to be conveyed? Is not this calculated to perpetuate the confusion which reigns in many minds on this subject? Dr. Lee has taught languages. I appeal to himself, whether it be easy for beginners or even advanced students to apply the same terms to different ideas, without some degree of mental obscurity. At all events, the reality of the distinction, the importance of precision, and the actual recognition of the distinction in grammatical nomenclature, are amply sufficient to demand either the retention of the old names, or, if these be inadequate, the substitution of new ones. That they are inadequate will, I think, be granted, when it is seen that the best grammarians have recognised a threefold instead of a twofold distinction of relative time. The terms I have proposed are not preoccupied as tense designations; and I humbly hope they are intelligible. But if writers on Hebrew grammar prefer using עָבָר, בְּעִתּוֹ, and עָתִיד, in the senses in which I have used anterior, central, and posterior, I have no possible objection. The term *athidh* means *ready*, and is exceedingly apt, as a designation of posterior time. *Benoni* is almost identical with central. And *abhar* may very well express *over*—the point of time contemplated, and therefore anterior to it.

6. I come now to the last point, which two of the three divisions of relative time are expressed by the Hebrew tenses? Dr. Lee says, the anterior and the central. At least, he says, I have borrowed everything else from him, and the position that the two tenses are the anterior and posterior is the theory of Jews. In the latter point he is certainly correct, as we may infer from the terms *abhar* and *athidh*, which they use to express these tenses. In my former paper I advanced three arguments to prove this position: first, the structure of these tenses; second, the strict antithesis in the use of them; and third, the existence of other means to denote centrality. I consider it no small confirmation of these arguments, that, in the fourth place, Jewish grammarians hold the same theory. The three formerly given have been as yet unnoticed by objectors, and, combined with the fourth, they far more than counterbalance the authority of some Arabian grammarians. Assuming Dr. Lee's theory (*Grammar*, pp. 327, 328), that the basis of the preterite (anterior) is a concrete, and that of the other tense an abstract noun, I submit, as a fifth argument, that if a concrete noun naturally implies a connection actually formed with existence, and is, therefore, fit to become the basis of the anterior or perfect, an abstract noun naturally implies a want of connection with existing things at the moment, and is, therefore, fit to become the basis of, not the central, which has connection with existing things, but the posterior, which has not yet such connection. Thus I conceive his theory of the basis makes more for me than it does for himself. I have
now

now done with Dr. Lee's objections, and I trust he will feel that I have not expressed myself disrespectfully towards him. At all events, it was far from my intention to do so. As to the charge of plagiarism, Professor Weir has kindly left me nothing to add.

7. In my former paper I stated that 'these authors (Ewald and Mr. Weir) agree in holding that the relation of time expressed by the Hebrew tenses is that of the event to a point of time in its immediate neighbourhood, and that in this I concurred with them' (p. 202, January, 1850). Ewald makes only two divisions of relative time: Professor Weir recognises three. On this point also I have been always at one with him. We differ still, however, as to the importance—I would say necessity—of a change of terms where there is a change of meaning, and as to the precise tenses signified by the two Hebrew forms. On the former point, Professor Weir will perceive how strong my feeling is from the remarks already made. And I now put it to himself whether the neglect of distinct and unequivocal terms may not have been the very reason why the correct views, caught by many learned Hebraists, of the main principle in question were not fully carried out by the authors themselves, or thoroughly appreciated and applied by their followers. Are we not in danger of becoming, to a certain degree, the slaves of ambiguous terms? Old terms, like old friends, I love as well as Professor Weir does; but I love to use them as they are, and not arbitrarily to make them be one thing at one time, and another at another, and so become equivocal. Is it not a striking and undeniable fact that grammatical works so far recognise the relation in question by the terms perfect and imperfect? And though these would not suit Professor Weir's hypothesis or mine, are we to create ambiguities and be less perspicuous than ordinary grammars, rather than invent, or, in fact, adopt distinct and appropriate terms? It becomes me not, however, to insist further at present on a topic which is certainly of secondary importance.

8. In the second place, Professor Weir calls that the present or central which I call the anterior. On reviewing his two papers with that care and attention which they demand, I observe a manifest vacillation or inconsistency in his statements concerning this tense. After combating Ewald's choice of the terms perfect and imperfect, he writes (p. 318, October, 1849):—'In that language (Hebrew) an action *done* and a present action *seem* to be one and the same thing. The very mention of an action *as performed*, implies that the action spoken of is regarded by the speaker as actually present.' Now, does not present here mean *at the given point*?—the point where the contemplating mind stands, not the literal present of the narrator? And is not this an action *done at a given point of time*? which is precisely the anterior tense. The next sentence diverges from what I have already quoted:—'The period of performance is for the moment his standing point.' Now, consistency demands, I submit, that this should be or mean, the period *immediately after* performance, &c. In that case, could there be a plainer description of the *præsens perfectum*, or anterior present, than he here gives? Now, the term *præsens* or
present

present in these definitions is confessedly improper, as the tense may refer to a point in past or in future time. Why retain, then, as a distinguishing name that which is really improper, and, what is worse, reject that which is characteristic and proper? Or, in a word, does Professor Weir say that the tense in question is not the *præsens perfectum*, but the *præs. imperf.* or the central present? Then, dropping, as before, the variable term, and retaining the constant, we have the central tense, a conclusion plainly inconsistent with the sentences above quoted. Again, in p. 495, October, 1850, Professor Weir writes:—
 ‘The writer takes his stand in thought at the event he records. That event he regards not only as *done*, according to Ewald, but as *done before his eyes*.’ And is this all the difference between Professors Ewald and Weir? Surely it is either nothing, or the advantage is all on Ewald’s side. For the latter means, *done before the eye of the mind*, which he correctly expresses by the current term, perfect; and if Professor Weir mean, *done before his actual eyes*, then he means the *præs. perf.*, the variable part of which definition had better be left out and the constant only retained. In fact, from these evidently well-weighed sentences of Professor Weir, I should certainly conclude that he meant by the present, the present perfect, were it not that he invariably translates by the present imperfect, and combats my translation, which more literally accords with his own deliberate exposition. At all events, may I not derive a sixth argument from Dr. Lee and Professor Weir taken together, each of whom agrees with me in a different tense, while otherwise they differ not only from me, but from one another?

9. If, however, it be still contended that the narrative of a third party affords no absolute criterion between Professor Weir and myself, I adduce as a seventh argument the usage of an individual speaking in the first person of himself, and therefore referring to the actual present. When Adam says, Gen. iii. 10, אָתִּי לִקְרָא שָׁמָעָהּ, does he mean, *I hear thy voice*, or, *I have heard thy voice*? When God says (iii. 11), מִי הַגִּיד לְךָ, does he mean, *Who tells thee*? or, *Who has told thee*? Does אֲכָלְתָּ מִפְּרִי עֵץ הַיָּדָע אֲשֶׁר צִוִּיתִיךָ לֵבְלֹתָ אֶבְלָתְךָ אֲכָלָהּ mean, *Dost thou eat of the tree of which I command thee*? or, *Hast thou eaten of the tree of which I have commanded thee not to eat*? After Cain was born, when Eve says (Gen. iv. 1) הֲגִיתִי אִישׁ, does she mean, *I get*, or, *I have gotten a man*? Does not לֹא יָדַעְתִּי הָשֹׁמֵר אֹחִי אָנֹכִי mean, *I have not ascertained; Am I my brother’s keeper*? (Gen. iv. 9), illustrate both the anterior and the central? Such instances might be multiplied at pleasure. Will any one say that *I have not ascertained* is not the correct translation of יָדַעְתִּי? Let him remember that the Latin *novi* and the Greek *οἶδα* are sufficient to prove a shade of difference between our use of *know* and their use of the corresponding verbs; and are not these forms a striking confirmation of the position that the Hebrew form is also a perfect? This leads me to remark that some of Professor Weir’s examples, which he lays down as foundation-stones in the construction of his theory, are not in point. To decide a question

as

as to the meaning of a form, the most simple and characteristic examples are to be chosen. Now, *אָד*, *מֵמִינִי*, *קָפִי*, and the like, as we see above, are clearly idiomatic, as *odi*, *memini*, and *capi*, are in Latin. If there had been no present imperfect form in Latin, it might have been speciously argued from these instances that the form they exhibit was the present imperfect. In like manner, *אָד*, and all other verbs expressive of state or continuance, do not come up to the full character of verbs or time-words, but are merely attributive stems with verbal formatives attached. They are deficient in the very characteristic of a verb, namely, time; and that is the very property we want to discriminate, and therefore they are manifestly unfit to be made the ground of a theory of tense. Active verbs only have the full character of time-words, and are, therefore, the only appropriate examples of time distinctions. Now, I think I have demonstrated, by unequivocal examples of active verbs in the first person, where the ambiguity of the word *present* cannot create confusion, that the time-form in question is really and necessarily anterior. If Professor Weir's theory would account for this fact, it must be modified exactly in the manner proposed in my former paper.

10. I have shown in my former paper also how all the cases of a series of events, past or future, can be explained consistently with this ascertained meaning of the former Hebrew tense, and with the simple principles of metaphysical truth. As Professor Weir, however, thinks my hypothesis less natural or easy than his own, besides the above fact left unexplained by his theory, I beg his attention to the following facts. In a *connected* series of past events, according to my hypothesis, the mind has to make no movement whatever. Standing, for instance, at the event expressed by *אָד* in the beginning of Genesis, it contemplates the anterior, the central, and the posterior events, so long as the connection is kept up without changing its position. According to Professor Weir, the mind changes its position in this example at least three times. It is first at the creation; next at the state of the earth; and, thirdly, at the brooding of the spirit: and the first leap, geologists say, is a very long one. Now, which of these is the more simple? Again, in a connected series of future events, on my hypothesis, the mind makes at most one movement; for it is first at the beginning and then at the end of the series. But, according to Professor Weir, it makes as many movements as there are events in the series; for he supposes it before the first, and present at each of the others. Which of these is more simple? May I not add an eighth argument in favour of my theory from the simplicity of the mental process it presumes? But if Professor Weir will still insist on his kind of simplicity, we might regard both tenses as central, and all will be simple enough. If he 'cannot imagine himself stationed at a day, or an hour, or even a minute's distance on *this* side of the event,' might I not retort by saying, I cannot imagine myself standing a minute's distance on *that* side of an event, and so insist on the so-called future being also a central tense? The argument will surely cut equally both ways, and so we may have two central tenses and all difficulty at

at an end, and at the same time all distinction of tense in the Hebrew verb!

But enough of this. I have stated, illustrated, and explained the philosophy of my theory of the tenses in my former paper, and adduced at least three arguments in favour of it, which have not been noticed. I have now defended it against objections, and added five other arguments, the fourth of which I regard as in itself decisive of the point at issue. I have now only to thank you for the space you have given me, and to assure you that I shall not resume the subject in a controversial way without a very urgent reason.

J. G. MURPHY.

ON THE INTERPRETATION OF ROMANS ix. 3.

To the Editor of the Journal of Sacred Literature.

Fraserburgh, Oct. 17, 1850.

SIR,—Permit me, through the medium of your Journal, to ask the author of 'Reconsidered Texts' a few questions concerning his theory of interpreting Rom. ix. 3, as exhibited in Nos. X. and XII. of your Journal.

1. Is not *γὰρ* of ver. 3, *causal*? Does it not introduce a reason for the statement of ver. 2? Does not your theory fail in this respect, that it exhibits *no object*, on which the Apostle's grief terminated, and exhibits *no reason* at all why he should have continual sorrow of heart? Would we not expect to find both of these in ver. 3 from the introductory *γὰρ*?

2. Does not your theory misplace *αὐτὸς ἐγώ*? You read it 'I could even wish that I were.' You thus connect *αὐτὸς ἐγώ* with *ἀνάθεμα εἶναι*. Had this been the connection intended by the Apostle, would it not have been written thus, *ἀνάθεμα εἶναι αὐτὸς ἐγώ*? But, according to the received reading, *αὐτὸς ἐγώ* is connected with *ἡχόμην*; and should be read 'I myself *ἡχόμην*,' i.e., 'I, even I myself who am now so much attached to the Christ, *ἡχόμην*.' There is no word for 'that' in the original, although you put it in your translation.

3. Does not the proper meaning of the imperfect indicative militate against your theory? Its *actual* time is *past*, and its *essential* time a *continued or repeated action*. There is nothing of the conditional or optative in it. Your two passages (Acts xxv. 22, and Gal. iv. 20) are doubtful, and questioned by some critics. Besides, does not the usage of the imperfect in the New Testament decide against you? (See Gal. i. 13; Matt. xiii. 34; Mark xiv. 12, xv. 6; Comp. Matt. xvii. 15; 1 Cor. xiii. 11.) Surely usage like this is more to be depended on than that supposed to be sanctioned by the two passages you quote. You say, 'had the reference been to a past undefined time, an aorist would have been the tense employed.' An aorist would have expressed the *pastness* of the action, but it would also have implied that it was merely momentary. (See Green's Greek Grammar of the New Testament,

tament, pag. 12, edition 1842.) As Paul wished to express not only *pastness* but also continuance, he was shut up to use the imperfect tense. I think these considerations would lead us to render the verb, according to its *natural* usage and import, 'I wished' or 'I used to wish.' 'For I myself used to wish.'

4. Does the New Testament usage of the word ἀνάθεμα warrant the meaning you attach to it? In all the passages where it occurs besides this one, does it not refer to something more, else, and beyond a mere *temporal calamity*? The following are the passages where it occurs:—Acts xxiii. 14; 1 Cor. xiii. 3, xvi. 22; Gal. i. 8, 9. These passages refer not to any temporal suffering of any kind, but to the everlasting endurance of the wrath of God, as a thing accursed. And this established New Testament usage completely settles the question against your theory. This being the case, of course the theory you propose about separating or enclosing by inversion and parenthesis ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ is found inapplicable.

The phrase ἡυχόμεν etc., should rather be translated thus:—'For I myself used to wish to be accursed from Christ,' i. e., 'When in my unconverted state, I used to wish to have nothing to do with him whom I now see to be the true Messiah, and I thus *in effect* wished to be for ever accursed.' (See Proverbs viii. 36, 'They act as if they loved death.') In ver. 2, Paul states his unutterable and tearful compassion for his brethren. Ver. 3 is not a statement of his love, but a reason for his grief on his brethren's account. And he was thus grieved because they were in the very position in which he was before his conversion, viz., they were wishing to be for ever accursed from him who is τοῦ Χριστοῦ. This appears to be more natural—less constrained—and more in accordance with the context than your interpretation, or any other that has been proposed.

If you think it worth while to give the foregoing a place in your next number you will oblige yours truly,

A. DAVIDSON.

To the Editor of the Journal of Sacred Literature.

British Museum, Nov. 30, 1850.

DEAR SIR,—I have to return you many thanks for the loan of Mr. Davidson's letter. His letter and my reply can thus appear together. My reply to its inquiries (for I must be concise) is this:—

That the cause of the Apostle's grief, viz., the perilous condition of his brethren, is so clearly implied by what follows, that there was no need to state it in set and formal phrase; that this grief included a concern for their welfare, and implied a willingness, on the part of the Apostle, to promote it; that γὰρ not unfrequently refers to that which; though suppressed, is implied (especially in rapid writing), as may be seen by carefully examining throughout, and in the original, any one of the Epistles of St. Paul;

That I do *not* misplace αὐτὸς ἐγώ; that I do *not* connect it with εἶναι,

εἶναι, but with ἡννόμην;^a that before the εἶναι I understand ἐμὲ, or ἐμαυτὸν; but that, if Mr. Davidson desires it, I am quite willing to leave out the objectionable 'that,' and to translate the εἶναι, 'to be,' instead of 'that I were;' seeing that 'to be' and 'that I were' are in point of fact equivalent;

That I understand the word ἀνάθεμα in the same sense as he does himself;^b that I only differ from him in supposing—that *anathema* would, in all probability, be the very word which the bigoted and High Church party among the Jews would be likely to bestow upon one who, as they considered, had renounced the faith of his fathers; that some, perhaps all of them, would really consider him to be that which the word declared him to be; and that it is to this their application of the word and to this their opinion that he refers, when he declares that 'for his brethren'^c he could even wish to be (i.e. to be held to be—vid. 1 Cor. i. 18, iv. 13) an *anathema*^d—for he well knew that his being denounced as such was his glory, not his reproach; and like his fellow Apostles before him, (when, having been scourged, they were commanded to speak no more in the name of Jesus,) rejoiced that he was 'counted worthy to suffer shame for His name;'

That Mr. D. has not disproved the correctness of my assertion, that 'to speak of things not as they really are, but as others suppose them to be, is common';^e that his remarks, therefore, do by no means 'completely settle the question;'

That with respect to the aorist, I have turned to Green's Grammar, edit. 1842 (to which Mr. D. refers me as proving his assertion, that 'an aorist would have implied that the action spoken of was *merely momentary*'), and I find that my statement,^f against which his remark is directed, is undisproved; inasmuch as the employment of the aorist, had St. Paul intended to express the prolonged wish of a bygone period, would have been an instance of the 'second' of Mr. Green's 'two parts'^g—of which 'second' Mr. D. takes not the slightest notice;

That with respect also to the use of the imperfect tense, I have made certain assertions which still remain to be disproved, viz., 'that when the imperfect tense is used to denote a past action or event, there is

^a See Journal, No. X., p. 498.

^b Vid. Journal, No. X., p. 496.

^c The sense of *ἡννόμην*, in the expression 'for my kinsmen, my brethren,' is manifestly 'for' in the sense of 'for the sake or advantage of,' as in John xvii. 19; Col. iv. 12, &c., *passim*—not 'for' in the sense of 'in the stead of,' as in Philem. ver. 13, &c.

^d As ἀνάθεμα is a substantive, not a participle, and as in our own language we have no exactly corresponding substantive, it would perhaps in a measure obviate the ambiguity that attaches to the word when translated as a participle, if the word be suffered to remain without translation, as in 1 Cor. xvi. 22.

^e See Journal, No. X., p. 496.

^f Viz., that 'Had the reference been to an *undefined* past time, an aorist would have been the tense employed' (as in Acts xxii. 4; xxvi. 9, 10; 1 Cor. xv. 9, &c.)—Journal, No. XII., p. 432.

^g 'The use of the aorist may be divided into *two parts*. The first is when the action is *really momentary*, or of *short duration*. The second is when (*though the action is really prolonged*) there is reason for merging the idea of this duration; as in *πεπλὸν ὁκνῶ ἐν ὅσῳ ἐρπάσκητε*.—Xen., *Cyrop.*, iii. p. 49'.—Green's Grammar, pp. 12, 13.

generally, if not always,^b conjoined therewith, some word or phrase of limitation, indicative of the time when, or place where, or circumstances under which the action expressed by that imperfect existed or took place: 'so that if the Apostle [using the imperfect] had intended to state what was once, but was now no longer his wish, *πότε*^c [as in Gal. i. 13, to which strangely enough Mr. D. refers me], or some such word would have been inserted;' and that 'the imperfect is used to denote not only contemporaneous, or customary action, but also in the case of verbs of desire or will, to express reserve or hesitancy;'¹

That the instances given by Mr. Davidson in disproof of these assertions, instead of disproving, confirm the first, and leave untouched the second; seeing that not one of them supplies a single instance of any

^b Not always indeed—but, I believe, *always* whenever any other imperfect than that of the verb 'to be' (which may or may not be so accompanied—vid. Rom. vi. 17; 1 Cor. vi. 11; xii. 2; 1 Pet. ii. 25; Eph. v. 8; Tit. iii. 3) is used to express a course of discontinued customary action, such as that of Rom. ix. 3, as explained by Mr. Davidson.

^c Sometimes this word or phrase is a preceding verb, the action expressed by the imperfect following that verb being contemporary, or connected with, or else immediately consequent upon that which is expressed by the verb (or participle) by which it is preceded; as in Acts xxvi. 11, Heb. xii. 9, 1 Cor. x. 4, 1 Pet. ii. 23, Matt. xiii. 34, Joh. iv. 2, Luke xxiv. 14, 27; in all of which the time referred to by the imperfect is the same time as that referred to by the verb preceding.

I am aware that in two of these instances, viz., Matt. xiii. 34, and John iv. 2, the imperfect is by many regarded as expressing 'continued customary action,' without any reference to the time of the verb preceding. It would, however, seem to be more consistent with analogy to suppose that the time referred to by the imperfect, in these instances, is the same as that of the verb by which it is immediately preceded;—though, so far as my positions with respect to the use of the imperfect are concerned, it is immaterial whether we regard them as instances of 'customary action sustained and permanent' (vid. note ^b), or whether as instances of an imperfect of contemporary time, i. e. of time contemporary with that of the verb preceding.

^k When the past customary action expressed by an imperfect was throughout sustained and permanent (as in Luke vi. 23, 'in like manner *did* their fathers;' John xi. 3, 'Now Jesus *loved* Martha;' id. xxi. 20, 'the disciple whom Jesus *loved*,' and the like), then the insertion of a *πότε* ('at one time') would be improper (for it would imply that the action spoken of was not enduring); whilst the introduction of any other word or phrase of the 'time when' is wholly needless, the period of the action being indicated by the period of the agents or subjects of the action; but if the past customary action was the customary action of a period only—i. e. if, after being continued for a time, it was abandoned and succeeded by another and different course of action—then, unless the imperfect expressing that action be the imperfect of the verb 'to be,' *πότε*, or some more definite indication of the period of that action, is, I believe, invariably given. Unless Mr. Davidson be able to oppose to this statement the production of at least one instance to the contrary, of course his translation of the unaccompanied *ἡχόμην* of Rom. ix. 3, can by no means be admitted. St. Paul often refers to his former life. Amongst all these references, is there not one instance of his employment of the imperfect, such as would warrant Mr. Davidson's translation? I believe there is not. If he employs the imperfect, either some such word as *πότε* is introduced, as in Gal. i. 13, Rom. vii. 9; or, as in Acts xxvi. 11, the 'time when' is indicated by its standing in connection with a preceding aorist. He often employs an aorist to express the non-continued but once customary action of his bygone years, but an unaccompanied abrupt imperfect, never.

¹ Journal, No. XII., p. 432.

verb expressive of 'desire or will;' and seeing also that in every one of them the 'time when' is so clearly expressed, that if I had collected them myself, I could not have desired to find any that should more decisively establish the truth of my positions with reference to the circumstances under which an imperfect requires to be accompanied ;^m

That the remark, that of my instances brought forward in support of the second of these assertions, 'two' out of four are 'doubtful and have been questioned by some,' as though there was any thing that by 'some' had not been questioned, is no disproof at all. Criticism such as this scarcely calls for a reply. Truth can never be elicited nor progress made, if the opinions of those who have preceded us (whoever they may be) be thus appealed to as decisive. The opinions of no one, living or dead, are worth a straw, except so far as he has been able to give a good reason for the same.

Of these 'some,' Mr. Green, however, to whom Mr. D. refers me, was certainly not one. He (Mr. Green) appears rather to acquiesce in the translation of *ἠυχόμεν* as given in the common version, and as retained by myself; inasmuch as he quotes one of these 'questioned' instances, viz. Acts xxv. 22, together with Romans ix. 3, (though without translating either of them,) as instances of 'idiomatic usage;' and illustrates them by a passage from *Æschines* (in *Ctesiph.* § 53), also untranslated, of which I gladly avail myself, as supplying another example of the employment of the *imperfect* of a verb of wishing, to express a *present* reluctance to give full and plain utterance to a *present* wish. I am far from supposing that the unaccompanied imperfect of a verb of wishing is to be always so regarded; but I believe that it may be so regarded, and even must, in the present instance, as well as in the four already given. The passage referred to is this:—*Ἐβουλόμην μὲν οὖν ὧς Ἀθηναῖοι, καὶ τὴν βουλὴν τοὺς πεντακοστούς, καὶ τὰς ἐκκλησίας, ὑπὸ τῶν ἐφεστηκότων ὀρῶς διοικεῖσθαι, κ.τ.λ.* 'I could wish,' O Athenians, both that the senate (the five hundred) and that our popular assemblies were duly controlled by those who preside, and that the laws ordained by Solon to secure order and decency in our debates were enforced, so that our elder citizens, rising before all others, as these laws direct, and without tumult or confusion, might make known to us, each one in his turn, the salutary counsels of his sage experience.'ⁿ

Now,

^m With respect to one of these instances, viz. Matt. xiii. 34, see *supra*, note ^l.

ⁿ 'It were to be wished.'—LELAND'S *Free Translation*.

^o In reply to Mr. Davidson's observation that 'in the indicative imperfect there is nothing of the conditional or optative,' I beg to refer him (that none of his remarks may remain unanswered) to the concluding portion of my paper, as given in the last number of this Journal. What is there said with reference to the objection that to translate the indicative *ἠυχόμεν* 'I could wish,' is to translate it as if it were a potential, is to the full as applicable to the objection as given by himself. Most true it is that the strictly *literal* translation would be 'I was wishing,' or 'I was praying.' As true also that even we ourselves sometimes hesitatingly express a *present* wish by saying 'I was wishing,' or a *present* thought by 'I was thinking.' But inasmuch as the English phrase, 'I could wish' (idiomatically understood), has precisely the same meaning as 'I was wishing' (idiomatically

Now, unless these assertions with respect to the use of the imperfect can be disproved, it follows as a necessary consequence that *ἠύχονην*, notwithstanding the doubts of 'some' and notwithstanding Mr. Davidson's denial, may be translated '*I could wish*'—(not, indeed, as being strictly literal, but as being strictly equivalent to the idiomatical use of the Greek imperfect); whilst it no less follows that the translation adopted by Mr. Davidson ('*I used to wish*') is wholly inadmissible. The one may be; the other cannot be.

With reference to the other parts of Mr. D.'s translation and interpretation, I believe that Mr. D. is in the wrong in supposing *αὐτὸς ἐγώ* (*I also*, i.e., *I as well as they*;) wrong also in supposing that the insertion of the article before *Χριστοῦ*, in the phrase '*from Christ*,' is intended to intimate the recognition of the claims of Jesus to be considered as the Christ in contradistinction to a past non-recognition. Why Mr. D. should suppose that this is the intention of its insertion I cannot conceive, except that his translation and interpretation of the verse demand the supposition. Can any such number of instances of *Χριστός* with the article be collected, as would warrant any such canon as that when the article is inserted, the expression *ὁ Χριστός* is to be understood as signifying the Christ considered as found to be that which at one time he was supposed not to be? Would Mr. D. consider this to be the meaning of *ὁ Χριστός* in other instances of its occurrence? I do not ask whether he would translate the article, but whether he would assign to it the force which he gives to it in the text before us. To confine ourselves to the single Epistle to the Romans, would he so understand it in such texts as the following?—

- Rom. viii. 35: 'Who shall separate us from the love of the Christ.'
 " xiv. 18: 'He that in these things serveth the Christ is acceptable to God.'
 " xv. 3: 'For even the Christ pleased not himself.'
 " " 7: 'Receive ye one another as the Christ received us, to the glory of God.'
 " " 29: 'In the fulness of the blessing of the gospel of the Christ.'
 " xvi. 16: 'The churches of the Christ salute you.'

Any reply to Mr. Davidson's remark that St. Paul desired '*in effect*' to be accursed, seems quite unnecessary; for if *ἠύχονην* cannot be translated as Mr. Davidson translates it, and if *αὐτὸς ἐγώ* is not equivalent to *καὶ ἐγώ*, and if the article before *Χριστοῦ* has not the force and design ascribed to it by him, it follows that the Apostle's *ἠύχονην εἶναι* expresses not that which he once '*in effect*' desired to be, but (as translated in the common version) that which he could even wish to be—either '*in reality*' (the common supposition), or (as supposed by

(idiomatically understood), except that '*I was wishing*' is with us the more colloquial and less dignified expression, '*I could wish*' is equivalent to '*I was wishing*,' so far as meaning is concerned, and superior to it as being less colloquial. '*I could wish*,' therefore, is to be preferred to '*I was wishing*.' '*I could wish*' may indeed appear to translate the imperfect indicative as if it were a potential, but it does not do so really, inasmuch as it does not so translate it in a potential sense.
 P Let Luke xxiv. 39, and Rom. xi. 1, the one an instance of *αὐτὸς ἐγώ*, the other of *καὶ ἐγώ*—(a lexicon or concordance will furnish many others), be compared together.

myself)

myself) 'in the estimation of others.' I have only to add that no attempt has been made by Mr. Davidson to set aside the *instances* produced by me to prove that the ἀνάθεμα εἶναι may be so understood; nor any in contravention of those produced in support of the opinion that the ἀπό is dependent upon εἶναι—not upon ἀνάθεμα.*

J. C. K.

DR. TREGELLES' PROSPECTUS OF A CRITICAL EDITION OF THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT.

DEAR SIR,—I am sure that no one who regards the Scriptures as the Word of God, and the only infallible standard of faith and practice in religion, can view with indifference any attempt that may be made to restore the text more nearly to its original integrity.

Of the *necessity* that exists for such attempts in the case of the Bible as well as the classics, no one who knows anything of the literary history of the sacred writings can entertain a doubt. The *desirableness* of such efforts being made must be equally unquestionable; not because any doctrine or precept therein contained is likely to be materially affected, either one way or another, by any amount of evidence that may be adduced for or against any particular reading; but because just in proportion to the importance which we attach to the contents of a document, and the esteem which we cherish for its author, will be our desire to know, with the utmost attainable exactness, what he actually wrote or caused to be written for our use.

That all that may and ought to be done for the emendation of the text of the New Testament has not yet been done, will also be admitted by every one at all acquainted with the present state of sacred criticism, or who has perused Dr. Tregelles' Prospectus, and his masterly review of Dr. Tischendorf's Greek Testament in the 8th and 9th Nos. of your Journal.

The plan which Dr. Tregelles has proposed to himself, combined with his habits of minute and attentive observation, and the intimate acquaintance which he possesses with the most valuable MSS., certainly encourages the hope that the results of his labours will go a great way to supply the desideratum of a good critical edition of this portion of Scripture.

The chief excellence of Dr. Tregelles' plan, as compared with those of his predecessors (although Bentley, Lachmann, and Tischendorf must be allowed the praise of having led the way), appears to me to consist in the judicious selection and arrangement of his materials. In the former he seems to have hit the happy medium betwixt an indolent contentment, on the one hand, with the text as it has happened to come into our hands, and the opposite extreme of uselessly perplexing himself and his readers with a farrago of modern Lections, which are of no further value than to show how the process of deterioration has kept pace with the number of successive transcriptions.

* Journal, No. X., p. 496.

* Id., No. XII., p. 432.

While

While he confines himself chiefly to such documents as are executed in the older style of writing, I think it well that the learned editor has not altogether rejected the testimony of Cursive MSS., two of which at least he mentions with approbation; for just as we know, on the one hand, that Uncial writing continued to be practised after the introduction of the Cursive character; so on the other, it is surely not improbable that Cursive MSS. may exist, bearing proof of having been faithfully copied from very ancient Uncial exemplars, and therefore entitled to at least equal deference with the more recent MSS. of the latter kind.

In the arrangement of his materials, Dr. Tregelles is to be congratulated on his having had the fortitude to resist the fascinations of that *Ignis Fatuus*, as I may call it, in criticism—the attempt to lay down a definite system of Recensions; and instead of weakening his conclusions by adherence to a classification for which no sufficient data appear to exist, simply arranging his MSS. according to their age.

In wholly repudiating, like Tischendorf, the *textus receptus* as a basis, Dr. Tregelles has taken a bold, but, I think, a justifiable step. For surely, if we consider how much has been accomplished of late years in the collection and examination of MSS. (in the latter department not least by Dr. Tregelles himself), it must be admitted that a text founded on the best and most ancient of these, by one who has devoted many years to the labour of inspecting his authorities with his own eyes, has a better claim to rank as a standard than one got up from such imperfect sources, and in so hasty a manner, as that to which this honour has hitherto been accorded.

The aim of Dr. Tregelles is also good so far as it goes, viz., ‘to present as far as possible the text commonly received in the fourth century.’ I say, so far as it goes, for it is undeniable that the ultimate and proper object of criticism is to ascertain, not the state of the text of a work at any particular period of its history, but, as nearly as may be, the condition in which it was left by the author; and that this object would not necessarily be attained, although we could determine with certainty the state of the text three centuries after its publication—a very little reflection will suffice to show.

That even much older MSS., if we had them, would not always give us what the author himself wrote, may be proved by a curious example in the history of the text of Livy. Quinctilian, who flourished not more than a century later, informs us (*Inst. Orat.* IX., 4, 74) that the work of the historian commences with the first portion of a hexameter, thus:—‘*Facturusne operæ pretium sim;*’ and that this *ordo verborum* is, in his opinion, preferable to an emendation which had already been introduced. Now it is remarkable that the emendation referred to has been transmitted by the MSS. which have come down to our times; and that had it not been for the explicit testimony of the rhetorician, we should never have known but that Livy had written ‘*Facturusne sim operæ pretium.*’

Dr. Tregelles himself supplies us with a similar instance in the case of the text of the Apocalypse; the mystic ‘number of the beast’ (xiii., 18) being variously given in different copies so early as in
the

the days of Irenæus, who flourished towards the close of the second century, and who affirms, on the authority of those who had personally known the Apostle, that the true number is that which still appears in our copies (666).

That the New Testament was not likely to escape the usual fate of works published in MS. only, is, I think, just what the nature of the case might lead us to expect; antecedently to any positive information on the subject.

If we reflect on the extraordinary rapidity with which the new religion was propagated, we must be convinced that copies of the writings of its first promulgators would be multiplied with proportionate frequency for the use of new churches and converts, and that (as Dr. Tregelles suggests) the chances of transcriptural error must thereby have been greatly increased.

Besides this, however, there are several circumstances which must have so far operated against the exercise of any extraordinary care in the transcription of the writings referred to. In the first place, it was not until they were collected into one, that a belief in their verbal inspiration equally with the Old Testament scriptures began to be entertained;* and this cannot be said to have taken place sooner than towards the middle of the third century. Then there is the fact that a much longer period elapsed before unanimity of opinion prevailed as to what books should be admitted into the Codex of the New Testament, so that even so late as the Council of Laodiceæ (A.D. 361) doubts were still expressed as to the claims of the Apocalypse to this honour. To these must be added the importance attached to tradition, which had its 'Canon' as well as the inspired records themselves, being regarded as a collateral branch of knowledge proceeding from the same common source; and the dogma of the continuance of the gift of inspiration in the Church—although in a lower degree than had been vouchsafed to the Evangelists and Apostles.

We are not left, however, to mere conjecture on this head, since we have the express testimony of Origen and others of the Fathers to the many variations presented by the MSS. which were in use in their day.

We shall also be less surprised to find that it was not until the middle of the third century that any formal attempt was made to reconcile conflicting testimonies, if we consider—that it is not for some time after a work has been published, that we begin to be solicitous about its text, or fully alive to the deterioration which it may in the mean time have undergone (of which the case of our own poet, Shakespeare, may serve as an illustration); and that the times in which the early Christians lived were not such as either to foster a taste for literary pursuits or to afford much leisure for its exercise. Nor did the recensions,^b undertaken at the period referred to, meet with acceptance either among the public in general or with those (such as Jerome) who were best qualified to judge of their merits.

* Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctr.* § 31.

^b Viz., those of Lucian and Hesychius.

When Dr. Tregelles therefore proposes to limit himself to the fourth century, we must understand him as undertaking no more than he considers himself able to perform; in which he sets an example worthy of universal imitation. The critic, indeed, cannot go further back than the evidence at his command will conduct him; and unfortunately, none of the MSS. of the New Testament which we possess can claim a higher antiquity than at most 1400 years; but as there are other helps of which criticism may legitimately avail itself in endeavouring to ascertain the original state of the text, it is well, I think, that Dr. Tregelles further proposes—‘in cases where there are certain proofs which carry us still nearer to the Apostolic age, to use the data so afforded.’

Of the ways and means to be employed for the accomplishment of this end, we shall be better able to judge when Dr. Tregelles' work itself makes its appearance. In the mean time, I cannot but remark, that among the principles by which the selection of various readings is to be regulated, there is one which must materially facilitate the attainment of the ulterior object contemplated; but which, it appears to me, neither Dr. Tischendorf nor Dr. Tregelles brings forward with that prominence to which it is justly entitled. I refer to the evidence for or against a reading which is derived from its internal goodness. This is a principle which has always been acknowledged and acted upon in the restoration of the text of profane authors; and to which a high place in Sacred Criticism likewise has been assigned by the most distinguished writers in that department.^c And such distinction appears to me to be no more than its due. For, to take the lowest ground, it is obvious, on the one hand, that no respectable author, much less one under the guidance of inspiration, can be supposed to commit to writing what is destitute of meaning, to contradict himself, or to say what is opposed to the plainest dictates of reason, or to well-known and universally admitted facts. We are also justified in expecting that the sentiments to which such an author gives expression shall be in keeping with his known character, with his avowed object in writing, and with the strain of the context in which they occur. On the other hand, it is equally clear, that we cannot always place implicit reliance on the antiquity, goodness, and number of MSS. It must be admitted, as shown indeed by the examples before adduced, that errors may have found their way into the best and oldest documents; and the higher the character of the MS. for general accuracy, the less the likelihood of such errors being suspected, and therefore the greater the chances of their propagation.

Without therefore in any case resorting to conjectural emendation, I humbly venture to think that a preponderance of external evidence (under which head I include Versions and Quotations, as well as MSS.) on one side, may be counterbalanced or even outweighed by the

^c As by Griesbach; who, whatever may be said of his system of recensions, or however we may sometimes consider that he has failed in the application of his principles, has always been looked up to as an authority on the general theory of the science.

strength of the internal evidence, supposing that to be on the other side.

How far Dr. Tregelles' third rule—in which he announces his intention to reject the authority even of the oldest MSS. in the case of 'undoubted transcriptural error'—will carry him in the use of this principle, I do not pretend to say, as this will mainly depend on what he assumes as the criteria of such 'error;' but judging from his silence on the subject when speaking of the Various Readings of Rom. v. 1, in the course of his remarks on Dr. Tischendorf's New Testament,^d I have felt some misgivings as to the extent to which he intends to make use of it.

There seems to be no doubt that the reading *ἔχωμεν* instead of *ἐχομεν* in that passage, has the greatest amount of external evidence on its side. The internal evidence, however, of which Dr. Tregelles takes no notice, appears to me to lean quite the other way.

In accordance with the laws of the Greek language, there is but one way, so far as I can see, in which the reading *ἔχωμεν* can be understood, and that is hortatively, 'let us have' (as in Heb. x. 19—26; xii. 28). But to this there are serious, if not insuperable objections. For, 1st. The Apostle is not here engaged in exhortation, but in argument, and that too of the closest kind; nor is there anything like an entreaty or command, whether expressed by the imperative or subjunctive mood, in either the preceding or following context, (viz. cc. iv. and v.) 2nd. The sense yielded by this Lction is inconsistent with the train of reasoning of the Apostle, as well as with the teaching of the New Testament in general on the topic more immediately referred to. The expression, 'peace with' or 'towards God through our Lord Jesus Christ' (comp. Acts x. 36) cannot, I apprehend, be taken as descriptive of a mere feeling, but of a state—a state of reconciliation to God (*καταλλαγῇ*) as it is elsewhere called, the opposite of that state of enmity spoken of in verse 10, and in other places, as characteristic of the natural man—a state of mind, in short, in which one may be, even when, from imperfect knowledge, confused ideas, weakness of faith, or other causes, he may have little or no comfort arising from a sense of it; and this is the view taken of the expression by the best Commentators on the passage.* Now, according to the Scriptures there is but one way in which sinful man can enter into this state, and that is by faith in Christ, and consequent justification (Eph. ii. 16, 17, with 8); and as this is the only way, so it is a sure way (Rom. viii. 1). But the Apostle sets out with assuming that those of whom he speaks are already 'justified by faith' (*δικαιωθέντες*), and therefore reconciled to God, or at peace with him; how then could he with consistency proceed to urge them to enter into that state? 3rd. The Apostle in verse 10 expressly takes for granted that the parties referred to were already reconciled (*κατηλλάγημεν, καταλλαγέντες*). 4th. Throughout the whole context he is evidently employed in setting forth the blessings resulting from the grand theme of his discourse—justification by

^d Journal, No. IX. p. 40; also Prospectus, p. 19.

* E. g. Bengel: 'Non jam hostes' (v. 10); 'nec iram metuentes' (v. 9).

faith. In particular, the *χαρὶν ἐν ᾗ ἐσχήκαμεν*, or 'state of acceptance with God,' in verse 2, is intimately connected with the *εἰρήνην πρὸς τὸν Θεόν*, or 'state of peace towards God,' in verse 1, by the conjunction *καὶ*, as if constituting two parts of one whole; the same verb *ἔχω* is also used in reference to both, only the perfect *ἐσχήκαμεν* is employed in speaking of the last-mentioned blessing, because in order of time it is prior to the former; and as the actual possession of the prior blessing is affirmed by the use of the indicative mood, we should certainly expect the enjoyment of the posterior privilege to be affirmed in like manner.

At the same time the external evidence for the vulgar reading is by no means contemptible. Besides two out of the eight principal MS. authorities (to say nothing of the reading of B, *secunda manu*, which may be very ancient) it has the countenance of the later Syriac, Ethiopic, and Slavonic versions: the first (if the Harclean be meant) important on account of its extreme literality, although it cannot be considered as altogether an independent translation; the second, venerable for its antiquity; the third, though not older than the ninth century, has always been esteemed of great value in criticism, as well for its servility, as for the excellent readings it contains. The versions on the other side are—the Vulgate and other Latin versions, the Coptic, older Syriac (or Peschito), and Arabic, no notice being taken of the Armenian. Now, while perhaps none of the other versions can be put in competition with the older Latin and Syriac,—even according to Dr. Tregelles himself,* very little, if any weight can be attached to the testimony of the Arabic versions; and if that which goes by the name of Erpenius be meant, it can hardly be allowed a separate voice from the Syriac, since in the Epistles it is understood to have been made directly from the Peschito.

I trust, therefore, that if Dr. Tregelles introduces the reading *ἔχωμεν* into his text, he will not omit to state his estimate of the other branch of evidence referred to, which in my view seems of sufficient weight to turn the scales in favour of the minority of MSS. and versions.

I will only add, in conclusion, that as Dr. Tregelles proposes, in every disputed case, to give a full and accurate statement of the authorities on both sides, so as to enable the reader to judge for himself, there will be less cause to complain, if at any time we should be compelled to differ from him in opinion.

W. S.

* Prospectus, p. 24.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

An Historico-Critical Introduction to the Pentateuch. By H. A. CH. HÄVERNICK, Doctor and Professor of Theology in the University of Königsberg. Translated by ALEXANDER THOMSON, A.M., Professor of Biblical Literature, Glasgow Theological Academy. Edinburgh, 1850. [The eighteenth volume of 'Clark's Foreign Theological Library.']

It is interesting to observe that, while Germany has been for some years peculiarly the soil on which writings in opposition to the authenticity of different books of Scripture have sprung up, it also has produced some of the most able defenders of those portions of Divine revelation which have been assailed. Amongst such defenders Hävernicks holds an honoured place.

The publication of an English translation of *this portion* of Hävernicks's Introduction to the Old Testament is particularly welcome to us; for although there is often a difference in the form and mode of attack adopted by English and German writers, still, whatever upholds the absolute authority of Scripture, and whatever shows the futility of those assaults which are most commended by apparent learning, must be of value in all general discussion of the subject.

Hävernicks goes over the whole ground minutely and laboriously; he deals with the actual difficulties which have been started; he shows their groundlessness one by one; and he gives the distinct evidence that the Pentateuch is actually an historic document, and that it is no imposture of a later age, but the genuine production of Moses himself.

Of course, we may take the New Testament as our starting point, and then we may show that every believer in the Divine authority of our blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ must admit the authenticity of the Pentateuch and all the rest of the Old Testament Scriptures: this, however, is a very different thing from the labour undertaken by Hävernicks; he attacks each specific point advanced by the objectors; and thus with laborious patience evinces the entire conformity of the internal contents of the Pentateuch with the external evidence in its favour, and with the statements of inspiration in the New Testament.

The assailants of the Pentateuch with whom we have to do in this country are of several classes:—we find the mere objectors to Scripture, who raise difficulties as to every point, and who place their 'subjective feelings' above evidence: these depend mostly on the statements made by German writers. There are also those who (like Norton in America) start wholly from a dogmatic ground: they refuse to acknowledge the authenticity of the Pentateuch, because they deny
that

that such and such *doctrines* can have really formed a part of revealed religion: the Scripture doctrines of *sin* and *atonement* are the real stumbling-blocks to them, and they therefore reject the record in which they are contained.

Besides these objectors, there are also those who treat the Old Testament Scriptures in a very peculiar manner: they professedly believe in the Divine authority of the New Testament, and in the absolute importance of its leading doctrines; but still they express a dread of what they call 'Bibliolatry,' and they evince this fear by the mode in which they speak and write of various parts of the Old Testament, especially of the Pentateuch: whatever clashes with their preconceived thoughts is at once called 'unhistorical.' It is hard to say what this word is precisely intended to convey: if a narrative which the Bible presents as a history be not historical, what is it? Is it imposture, or what?

Hävernicks *Introduction* has no small value in meeting *all* these forms of objection: the *last* of these is to some minds the most dangerous, and on that account we can particularly recommend the volume before us.

Mr. Thomson, the translator, well remarks, in his preface, that 'the Mosaic authorship and the historical credibility' are 'points that are essentially connected.' We could have wished for further introductory observations from so able and judicious a translator, but he postpones the reader to the notice of Hävernicks and his merits as a writer, which is to precede the translation of his *General Introduction*, a work to be executed by Dr. W. L. Alexander.

The translation of the *General Introduction* will, in a certain sense, be introductory to the volumes before us; and it will also be found, we believe, a valuable contribution to Biblical learning. Mr. Thomson has our cordial thanks for what he has executed, and so has Dr. Alexander for what he promises.*

Sunday Services at Home, for Young Children. By different Authors. Edited by the Countess of Ducie. Hughes, Ave-Mariane. 1851.

To write a child's book is no childish task, but the greatest intellects may exhibit their loftiest powers in distilling their acquirements into the understandings of infants. The highest use of knowledge is, in fact, to instruct others; and where the truths to be taught are most difficult, and the minds which are to receive them most limited in capacity, the problem of teaching is proportionally more arduous, and success more honourable. Hence, we are glad to direct the attention of our readers to this unpretending book of 'Services at Home, for Young Children.' The table of contents shows a series of valuable and important topics, the list of contributors contains eminent names; so that the public cannot but be interested in observing how their task has been accomplished. We have only to mention those of Mr.

* Might we suggest the importance of furnishing such works as the present with a good *Index*?—few pieces of editorial labour would be more valuable.

Champneys, of Whitechapel, Mr. Harrison, of Birch, Mr. Robert Bickersteth, of Clapham, to show that high talent has been brought to bear.

We are not a little rejoiced that a Christian lady of rank should undertake to place in the hands of mothers and instructors so pleasing a manual. Lady Ducie is in every way deserving of our thanks, and we cordially wish her every possible success, and that her work may be of wide and extended usefulness. The idea is in some degree novel, but eminently practicable. We quote her Ladyship's own preface:—

'One service in the church is generally considered sufficient for young children. A second service at home, brought down to their level, may be made a source of spiritual improvement to them; and, what is of no small importance, train them to listen to what they hear in the house of prayer.'

It is quite evident that with the assistance of this collection of infantine sermons a judicious parent may be enabled to win the attention of a little congregation, in a service which shall really be accommodated to their capacity—a privilege which is in public seldom enjoyed. We have heard of such arrangements being made by zealous clergymen, and with great success, but they have been entirely exceptional cases. It will now be in the power of every head of a family, and every conductor of an educational establishment, to hold a service of this kind 'at home;' and the sermons we now notice, and others following in their wake, will effectually secure this desirable object.

We have our own theory as to the process of conveying instruction to infant minds; and with this in view, it has been interesting to us to observe how near the various authors of these sermons have approximated to it in their respective modes of teaching. The unsown mind of infancy, be it observed, is not at all like the neglected mind of adult age. In the latter, every faculty is more or less blunted by disuse or limited application. The observant powers have been directed to low objects, the imagination has been materialized, the memory has been made the depository of the most common-place events, and the power of comparing, or that of reflecting, has never been brought to bear. Every mind has, of course, had some exercise, but 'its nature has conformed to that it worked in.' The mechanical drudgery of many occupations, whether it be threshing wheat or watching the spindles in a cotton factory, may well be conceived to have a withering influence on the mental faculties.

Preachers to uneducated congregations—of those who, in the humbler classes, have their hands full of mechanical drudgery—know how hard it is to set forth the most simple truths so as to be intelligible. Their only hope is, to make the ideas which are familiar to those whom they address the vehicle of their instruction. The missionary failed in teaching the Hottentot herdsman his alphabet, until he associated the letters in the fancy of his pupil with the individual oxen of a herd; and thus the teacher must leave all metaphysical abstractions, and clothe all his thoughts with the reality of common life.

In preaching to children, the task is different. A child's fancy is active, his memory is retentive, but his experience is necessarily limited, and

and his acquaintance with external objects only in its commencement. Abstract ideas are still more out of the question than with adults, however ignorant; and properties and attributes must scarcely be separated from their objects. The art of securing attention depends entirely on the degree of activity to which the faculties are excited. The fancy is vigorous, therefore images must abound; the affections are warm, therefore they must be appealed to; the moral sensibilities are acute, therefore the greatest care should be taken to establish the clearest distinctions between right and wrong.

It is quite clear that, with regard to children, the metaphysical axiom is specially true—*Nihil in intellectu quod non fuerit in sensu*. The first thing is to appeal to sense, through the medium of the fancy. The child must be made to *see* every group, and *hear* the words of every speaker, and the character of each person of the sacred scene must produce its corresponding emotion. We imply that historical preaching must be resorted to. The moving incidents of the Gospel narratives are pre-eminently calculated to arrest the attention of the young. The purity and loveliness of the Saviour's character specially commend themselves to their affections. Children also love what is true; they are arrested by what is wonderful. In the miracles of our Lord, this appetite is in the very best manner satisfied, and the narrative is always the vehicle of the loftiest truth. It may be added, that simplicity of language, a desideratum in all instruction whatsoever, is best secured by adhering to these principles. That mode of diction which awakens the fancy and appeals to the affections, will be far more simple than that which is measured by letters and syllables. Monosyllables may be convenient for a first spelling-lesson, but are by no means confined by popular usage to the expression of primary ideas. We observe many passages in this very book where such restrictions have been discarded, in which affectionate earnestness has not only secured what is obvious to children, but what is elegant and powerful to the adult reader.

Among the sermons which we have perused with pleasure may be mentioned those entitled 'Cain and Abel,' 'Timothy, the Young Disciple,' 'God is Love,' 'Heaven and its Rewards,' and 'The Lost Sheep.' 'Heaven and its Rewards' abounds in affectionate language and elegant illustration. It is evidently the production of a pen which has been often employed in writings of this character. The object of the writer of 'Timothy, the Young Disciple,' is to bring vivid portraiture before the minds of children, and so impressing *facts* upon their memories. The sermons entitled 'God Omnipotent,' and 'God a Holy Being,' deal too much in abstract doctrines for infants; but if considered as addresses to older children, they may be regarded as masterly productions, exhibiting considerable vigour of style.

We are quite sure that this little volume will be accepted as a great boon by many a mother anxious for the spiritual instruction and edification of her charge. After a careful perusal of its entire contents, we say, with more significance than is often implied in 'notices of

of books,'—This volume ought to be in the possession of every Christian mother.

An Exposition of our Lord's Intercessory Prayers; with a Discourse on the Relation of our Lord's Intercession to the Conversion of the World. By JOHN BROWN, D.D. Edinburgh: W. Oliphant and Co. 1850. 8vo.

IT is, perhaps, enough to recommend this book, to say that it is the production of the Dr. John Brown, the author of the work on the *Discourses and Sayings of our Lord*, reviewed in another part of this Number of the Journal; and also of the *Expository Discourses on First Peter*, noticed in vol. ii. p. 372. Considering the advanced age of the writer, with the full and rapid outpouring of works so rich in the ripened fruits of sacred thought and Christian experience, one is impressively reminded of the touching words of that Apostle, to whose writings this venerable and gifted minister of Christ has given special consideration: 'Knowing that shortly I must put off this my tabernacle . . . I will endeavour that after my decease ye may have these things always in remembrance' (1 Pet. i. 13, 14). There is a sense in which there is *not* 'one glory of the sun;' for it is sometimes seen that the glory of its setting hour is greater than that of its noontide splendour. It is our hope, however, that Dr. Brown's sun is yet far from its setting, and that he may be spared to send forth yet more of these floods of light and knowledge, to cheer and instruct numbers who live beyond the range of his personal influence.

Of the prayer contained in the 17th chapter of John's Gospel the author says in his Preface:—

'All that is most peculiar and wonderful in Christianity is here. . . . I cannot recollect a period when this chapter had not a solemn charm for me; but it is comparatively of late that I have made it a subject of thorough critical examination. Providential circumstances seemed to say to me, "Now turn aside to see this great sight." In complying with this call, I trust I did not forget that the place whereon I stood was holy ground; and as I drew near, if I do not strangely mistake, the objects of contemplation became more distinct, though not less glorious. I think I understood this passage somewhat better than I did; and I am willing that, if it be so, my Christian brethren should be sharers of my satisfaction. I know of no enjoyment to be compared with that of obtaining satisfying views of Divine truth; and none in which the feeling of a wish for the sympathy of the like minded more naturally rises in the heart. "Rejoice with me." "O taste, and see that the Lord is good."—pp. viii., ix.

Again, in the Introduction, Dr. Brown observes—

'The Scriptures of truth given by inspiration of God contain many wonderful things; but none more wonderful than this—none so wonderful. It is the utterance of the mind and heart of the God-man, in the very crisis of his great undertaking—in the immediate prospect of completing, by the sacrifice of himself, the work which was given him to do, and for the accomplishment of which he had become incarnate. It is the utterance of these to the Father who had sent him. What a concentration of thought and affection is there in these few sentences! How "full of grace," how "full of truth!" How condensed, yet how clear, are the thoughts—how deep, yet how calm, the feelings which are here, so far as the capabilities of human language permit, worthily expressed! All is natural and simple in thought and expression, nothing intricate or elaborate; but there is a width

width in the conceptions which the human understanding cannot measure, a depth which it cannot fathom. There is no bringing out of these plain words all that is seen and felt to be in them.'—pp. 1, 2.

To the consideration of this solemn and important passage of Scripture, the author has come in a reverent and devout spirit. He has looked far, and with clear and enlightened eyes, into the deep and mysterious things which it contains; and not seldom he is kindled by the sublime themes which this glorious chapter opens, into a strain of warm and vigorous eloquence. The description, for instance, of the resurrection of the righteous dead, and the absorption of the living, at the coming of Christ, is unsurpassed by anything we know of the kind in the English language. To read it rouses the too sluggish soul into inordinate longings for the coming of that great day. It is founded upon our Lord's desire, 'Father, I will that those whom thou hast given me may be with me where I am, that they may behold the glory thou hast given me.'

The reader knows that the chapter which forms the subject of this volume brings the mind into contact with some of the profoundest mysteries of grace and redemption. Into these the author has, when occasion offered, searched with a most discerning and experienced spirit of 'a scribe well instructed in the kingdom of God;' and it is no small recommendation of this most 'profitable' work to say, that few will rise from its perusal without a clearer apprehension of such passages, as well as of the entire scope of this Divine Prayer, than they previously possessed.

Exposition of the Gospel of St. Luke, in a Series of Lectures. By JAMES THOMSON, D.D. Chapters IX.-XX. Vol. II. Edinburgh: Adam and Charles Black. 1850.

THIS volume continues the work of which the first volume was noticed in Vol. IV., p. 180, of this Journal. It appears, therefore, that the author intends to appropriate an entire volume to the four last chapters of Luke's Gospel, after having disposed of twenty chapters in two volumes. We cordially approve of this intention; and, on this scale, the work, when completed, will form the only work of any importance upon the Gospel of St. Luke, separately taken, which the English language possesses. It also forms a very admirable example of that mode of lecturing continuously on particular books of Scripture, which might be made instrumental of imparting much Scriptural and religious knowledge, in its best and most interesting shape, to the people, and which we have always been disposed very earnestly to recommend.

The present volume fully sustains the character which we ascribed to the work on the appearance of the first volume. The deep interest of the matter, with the clearness and animation of the style, render this one of the most readable works of the kind that ever came into our hands; while the frequent originality and constant freshness of the writer engage the attention of even those who have read much on the subjects of which he treats, and interrupt the progress of the
reading

reading by frequent pauses for thought and reflection. Books like these furnish real food—substantial nutriment, to the mind, and are of incalculable value for the knowledge and use of Scripture which they impart. These Expository Lectures on Luke, with the noble Expository Discourses of the venerable Dr. John Brown on St. Peter, and on the Discourses and Sayings of our Lord, form a body of writing in this direction remarkable as being all produced within two years, and which is in the highest degree creditable to the theological literature not only of Scotland, but of the English language.

It is not one of the least merits of Dr. Thomson's able work, that he nowhere shrinks from any of the apparent 'difficulties' of the portion of Scripture he has chosen for his consideration. Rather they are sought out by him, and in general are satisfactorily solved with not less acuteness and knowledge than unpretending simplicity of statement. This combination of qualities in any writing is the sure mark of a master's hand. We would gladly indulge our readers with some extracts from this fine book; but in submitting to a constrained abstinence from this indulgence, can cordially recommend the work to them as one which ought to be in their possession.

A Devotional Exposition of the Book of Psalms; containing an Argument for each Psalm, a Paraphrase, suggestive Remarks, and Parallel Scriptures in Words at length. By the Rev. J. EDWARDS, M.A. London: James Darling. 1850.

It is, no doubt, true that, as the author of this work states, the Book of Psalms forms that portion of the Sacred Volume which is, of all others, peculiarly adapted to the devotional requirements of the Church. 'Both the train of thought, the energetic language, and the varied outpourings of the heart there recorded, are united to the emergencies of joy and sorrow, which may call forth in private communion with our Maker the expressions of anxious prayer and of grateful praise.' It is also true that they contain 'much that is obscure, and much that requires elaborate learning, as well as great discernment and skill in exposition, that they may be properly understood and appreciated.' But he has judged, and we apprehend rightly, that books intended to be *practical aids to devotion* and spiritual improvement, cannot be either too simple or too free from the *processes* of critical learning and inquiry. Under these views he has chosen the form of a Paraphrase. We confess to no special liking for Paraphrases; but this is a matter of taste, and we must admit that there is no better application of paraphrase than in adapting the Psalms to the use Mr. Edwards contemplates. Many persons, looking only at the absence of learned notes and criticisms, may suppose the construction of a paraphrase easy work. They would be grievously mistaken. We know no work more difficult than the construction of a good paraphrase. The paraphrast must make up his mind as to the meaning of every sentence, often by laborious critical research; and he must state the *results* definitely, as incorporated in his paraphrase, without any indication of his reasons, or of the

process which has led him to the conclusions he exhibits. This is not only a very arduous, but a very self-denying task; and there are very few who, in using such works, have any conception of, or are qualified to give the author adequate credit for, the skill and labour expended on their production. Such work has, however, far higher reward than any which the praise of man can give.

It seems to us that Mr. Edwards has executed his task with judgment, especially evinced in his not having overlaid the text with more words than are strictly necessary to bring out the meaning he apprehends it to bear. This is a great merit, as we are thus prevented from losing sight of the text in the paraphrase. This is altogether a beautiful volume. On each side the paraphrase are ruled columns, one of which is devoted to 'Scripture testimonies,' or parallel passages, in words at length; and the other to 'suggestive remarks,' which for the most part embody Christian and devotional applications of the passages beside them, intended to guide the reader into the trains of thought suitable to the occasion in hand. In the body of the work the sacred text is distinguished by italic type from the paraphrase.

The Doctrine of the Cherubim; being an Inquiry, Critical, Exegetical, and Practical, into the Symbolical Character and Design of the Cherubic Figures of Holy Scripture. By GEORGE SMITH, F.A.S. London: Longman. 1850.

MR. SMITH is the author of a very excellent book on the Religion of Ancient Britain, and, more lately, of a work entitled *Sacred Annals*, which we hope ere long to discuss along with other books of a kindred nature. The present small volume is a very able and interesting discussion on a Biblical question of considerable importance, to which the author brings his usual good sense and clearness of statement. After discussing the various opinions which have been entertained on the subject, or rather the two principal of them—that the Cherubim represented Divine persons and attributes, or that they represent an order of angels, he produces his own view—namely, that the Cherubim were designed to represent the whole of those saved by the Great Atonement. Mr. Smith fairly and carefully examines every text of Scripture that bears on the subject, and testing by them the view he has taken, finds them favourable to it. In this explanation, however, the text least favourable to this interpretation has escaped his notice. It is that in which St. Peter, alluding to the tabernacle cherubim bending over the ark, says, 'Which things *the angels* desire to look into' (1 Pet. i. 12). The view is, however, well worthy of serious consideration, and is here produced in a reverent and thoughtful spirit. The author seems to set it forth as a new view of the case, and he is, doubtless, unaware that others have produced it before him, though not with the same completeness of development. We may refer, for instance, to Professor Bush's Notes on Exodus, in which what is substantially the same view is advocated; as it was also, nearly a century ago, by Dr. Gill, who, in his *Exposition*, alleges that the Cherubim denoted

denoted the saints in general, and the ministers of the word in particular. Other and still older authorities for this interpretation exist.

A Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament. By EDWARD ROBINSON, D.D., LL.D. A new Edition, revised and in great part re-written. London. Longmans. 1850.

THIS is the English duplicate edition—or rather, we apprehend, an importation of the American edition with a new London title—of Professor Robinson's excellent and well-known Lexicon of the New Testament. The value of this work, and its appreciation by the public, have been attested by the appearance of three rival reprints and two abridgments of the original edition in this country. It is at this day needless to say anything in commendation of a work so well known; but the claims to the gratitude of 'the theological public,' which Dr. Robinson had established by the original work, are very materially strengthened by this new edition. Since that work appeared, the progress of science in this new department, as in others, had not ceased to be onward. Wahl and Bretschneider had issued new and corrected editions of their Lexicons, and Winer had revised and enlarged his Grammar; while the labours and improvements of Passow had been carried forward after his decease by able successors, and the more extended results appeared before the English public in the very valuable Lexicon of Liddell and Scott. Still more, the Commentaries of De Wette and Meyer had appeared, to say nothing of many others. Dr. Robinson had also, in the mean time, explored the Holy Land, and his official duties had called him to the daily interpretation of the New Testament before large classes of young men preparing for the ministry of the Gospel. Thus, as he explains, when he sat down to the work of revision, he found many parts of his former labours, especially the earliest, less satisfactory than he had hoped; and the result was, that a large part of the work required in his judgment to be re-written. It has accordingly been re-written, 'without regard to time or labour.' The remaining portions have been thoroughly revised; and have received very many additions, corrections, and curtailments. In its present form the work may assuredly, as the author modestly hints, 'stand as an unpretending memorial of the progress and condition of the Interpretation and Lexicography of the New Testament, at the close of the first half of the nineteenth century.'

Few students would have perceived the need of the great additional expenditure of time and labour thus bestowed on the improvement of the original work; but on comparing the two, he will find that the work has indeed largely profited by the conscientious earnestness with which the learned author applies himself to whatever he undertakes, and there can be no question that the well merited result will be to maintain it for many years to come as the standard Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament.

The Blank Page Bible. The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, with copious references to Parallel and Illustrative Passages; and the alternate pages ruled for MS. Notes, in a manner hitherto unattempted. London. Bagster and Sons. 1850.

So far as the letterpress is concerned, this edition is the same with the facsimile reprint, with larger types, of the English version of Bagster's Polyglott version, which was formerly noticed in the *Journal of Sacred Literature*. The novelty consists in the interpaging, so that every page of text has an opposite page of blank paper for MS. notes. *Interpaging* will be distinguished from *interleaving*. In the latter, the reverse page is always inconvenient to write upon; but in this mode of interpaging one has always the most convenient side for writing, the other being occupied with the text. We have not alternately the right and left pages for writing, but always the right page, and the book lies firmly upon the table while writing. Wherever the volume is opened, the student sees the left page always filled with the text, and the right page always blank. And this is not the end of the convenience which the volume offers for students, for the blank page is ruled with blue lines, and reference is materially facilitated by those pages having printed headings of book, chapter, and verse, corresponding to the opposite printed page. The result as to the interpaging is effected by only one side of the paper being printed on, which affords the incidental advantage of rendering the type beautifully distinct. The book is indeed printed throughout on thin writing-paper, so that the blank pages can be written upon with any kind of ink or pen without the ink appearing through the paper on the printed side of the leaf. Simple as this contrivance seems, it does great credit to the inventive ingenuity of Messrs. Bagster, in meeting the almost undefined wants of Biblical students, to whom this beautiful volume will form a priceless acquisition. We trust that the publishers may ere long be induced to apply the same process to the Hebrew Bible and Greek Testament. There is at the end of the volume an interpagined Index, enabling the reader to turn without loss of time to any note he may have made.

Light in the Dark Places; or Memorials of Christian Life in the Middle Ages. Translated from the German of the late Augustus Neander. London. Sampson Low. 1850.

THIS little work is a translation, by a lady, of the Second Part of Neander's 'Denkwürdigkeiten aus der Geschichte des christlichen Lebens,' which may be regarded as a popular and practical supplement to his 'History of the Christian Religion and Church.' It is an excellent translation of a very beautiful book; and, as the translator hopes, it cannot but tend

‘to strengthen our reverent love for the good men of other times, while manifesting their mistakes; to lessen any blind homage for “the golden mean” of time, while unveiling the lights which have shone before those who watched for them in the darkest ages; to dispel any sentimental worship of times, and seasons, and human institutions; and at the same time to enlarge our sympathies with that holy church

church of the redeemed and the regenerate, which is Catholic among the centuries as well as among the nations.'

Alluding to the gifted author of the book, she says :—

'And now that his words come to us with the touching solemnity of a voice which death has so recently silenced, may we listen to them, and learn from them, in the spirit which he would desire, from the place of rest to which God has taken him, where all the broken glimpses of the truth, which cause error and division here, are filled up; and he has learned, ere this, to know even as he is known.'

The work contains many interesting anecdotes of the Christian character, conduct, and sentiments of persons of various nations and centuries. The very names and existence of most of them are probably known to few English readers. This essential newness, with the intrinsic interest of the contents, and the popularly 'readable' character of the work, will, we feel assured, render the publication very acceptable to all who delight in contemplating the manifestations of Divine grace in the hearts of men.

A View of the Evidences of Christianity; and the Horæ Paulinæ.

By WILLIAM PALEY. A new Edition, with Notes, an Analysis, and a selection of Questions from the Senate House and College Examination Papers. Designed for the Use of Students. By ROBERT POTTS, M.A. Cambridge: University Press.

THE Senate of the University of Cambridge having in 1849 decreed that, commencing in 1851, the Holy Scriptures and the Evidences of Christianity should assume a more important place than formerly in what is called the Previous Examination—the present edition has been prepared to meet this requirement as to the Evidences, Paley's work having been used in the University as the authorized text-book on the Evidences for the last quarter of a century. But of course what has been effectively done to serve this end cannot but be of use to the private and general student. The prefixed Analysis is a copious abstract of the whole work. The Notes consist of the original passages which are referred to in the text, and of such remarks as appeared necessary for the illustration or amplification of the Argument—and form a valuable help to the student. The Questions are such as have been actually asked at different Examinations in the course of years. They are for the most part well calculated to exercise the knowledge and test the reading or recollection of the student. Many of them are answered directly from the text, but some are to be answered by inferences drawn from it, or from the facts recorded in the Scriptures. Taken altogether, this is one of the most useful books of the kind we have seen—nothing redundant—nothing wanting.

Christianity in Harmony with Men's Nature, Present and Progressive. Seven Lectures. By the Rev. GEORGE LEGGE, D.D. London. John Snow. 1850.

THIS work owes its existence to the translation of the eloquent Pastor Coquerel's Discourse on the same subject, which formerly appeared in
our

our own pages.* The author liked the outline of Coquerel's sermon, and he thought he could turn it to account in his own way, so as to diversify and enhance the interest of his ministrations during the winter months. He accordingly prepared these Lectures, which were delivered in the Gallowgate Chapel, Leicester, with such success that he was requested to give them to the public. Each of the heads of Coquerel's discourse is here expanded into a distinct one—with some independent of this connection; and the task is executed with much power of illustration and considerable reach of thought. There is more of what the author himself calls the 'rhetorical swell' than we much relish in printed books. But the author himself feels this, and excuses himself for not having tamed his discourses down to 'didactic sobriety' for the press, on the ground that their character would have been too greatly altered by the process, and that 'he has something else in his mind of the same sort, but on a more extensive scale and of a more ambitious aim.' In this he hopes to show it 'possible to set forth Christianity in entire accordance with the scientific mind, the moral sentiment, and the æsthetic spirit of the age.' This is a great and worthy task; and, from the work before us, we should judge that Dr. Legge might execute it with fully as much success as he anticipates.

Horæ Paulinæ. By WILLIAM PALEY, D.D., with Notes, and a Supplementary Treatise entitled *Horæ Apostolicæ.* By the Rev. T. R. BIRKS, M.A. London: Religious Tract Society. 1850.

MR. BIRKS has appended to the 'Horæ Paulinæ' some (not many) useful and interesting notes, corrective or explanatory of the author's statements. But the distinguishing feature of this volume is the original work annexed to it under the title of 'Horæ Apostolicæ'—which is considerably larger than Paley's own performance. This addition is of high merit and great value; and the author is to be commended for the modesty which has enabled him to set forth a production of this original importance as an appendix to the work of an established author. By this, however, the public is much advantaged, being put in possession of the whole of this great and beautiful argument. In this portion Paley's argument is carried still further, many coincidences are gleaned which he had overlooked, and the inquiry is extended to the four Gospels. Nearly all that was most striking, and most obvious when the idea had once occurred, having, with his usual felicity of style, been brought together by Paley, it cannot of course be said that the gleanings of Mr. Birks are of value comparable to the vintage of Paley. There were, however, many rich clusters left for him to gather, and here we have them—presented with a skill and discernment which shows the author to be well qualified for the task he has undertaken. The volume as it stands may be taken as embodying all that is truly valuable in the line of inquiry which Paley started in the most original and interesting of his works—of all that has accrued

* *Journal of Sacred Literature*, vol. iv. p. 34.

thereon since he wrote. Any future students of the 'Horæ Paulinæ' will do ill to dispense with the aid of Mr. Birks' important and most essential supplement to that work.

A Universal Geography, in Four Parts: Historical, Mathematical, Physical, and Political. By the Rev. THOMAS MILNER, F.R.G.S. Illustrated by ten Maps, with Diagrams and Sections. 12mo. Religious Tract Society.

THIS is an admirable book—the best of the kind we ever met with, or that it seems possible to produce. It is full of information, which must have been got together with great and protracted labour—and much of it of a sort not at all to be found in the common works of this class. The book is the only one we know of that presents in a generally accessible form a combined view of historical, mathematical, physical, and political geography; and it will, as intended, be of excellent use to the general home reader; and still more to the emigrant 'who may wish to take to the far bounds of civilized life a cheap and portable compendium of information relative to countries with reference to which his means of information will necessarily be limited.' It is also well suited to the use of Colleges and Schools—to which it is, or is to be, further adapted by a set of Exercises. The work is interspersed with a great number of useful tables on almost every matter bearing on the condition of man and of his habitation. The section on Physical Geography is especially interesting and valuable. In the Political Geography a vast body of information, corrected to the present time, is packed very closely. We have noted only one defect—that the amount of revenue of the several European states (except Great Britain) is not given, nor the extent of the military or naval force—information easily obtained, and that ought to be supplied in a work like this. There are several good maps by Petermann—four of them in Physical geography. In the political maps, a general idea of the relative population of the towns is afforded by the form of the mark which denotes its site.

The Chronological Testament, in which the text of the Authorized Version is newly divided into Paragraphs and Sections, with the Dates and Places of Transactions marked, the Marginal Renderings of the Translators, many Parallel Illustrative Passages printed at length, brief Introductions to each Book, and a running Analysis of the Epistles. London: R. B. Blackader, 1851.

THIS is the work of which we gave an anticipatory announcement in the last number of the Journal, p. 516. We have little to add to the description of it there given, except to state that the complete work fully answers to the description, and sustains the character we gave.

Usefulness is the essential characteristic of this edition of the New Testament, and the Editor is entitled to much praise for the thought and labour he has bestowed in devising and working out so many happy contrivances and arrangements for the full, profitable, suggestive, and edifying

edifying use of the sacred volume. It is altogether a most desirable book for general use; and we trust that its reception may be such as to encourage the Editor to execute his design of producing the Old Testament on the same plan. The work is dedicated to Bishop Thirlwall.

The Bible Revised. A carefully Corrected Translation of the Old and New Testaments. By FRANCIS BARHAM. Part I., Ecclesiastes: Part II., Song of Solomon: Part III., Micah. London: Houlston and Stoneman, 1848-50.

THESE are little books at sixpence each. The form in which they are put forth affords no proper idea of the extent and importance of the undertaking; and we think the plan, both as to the form of the publication, and the irregular manner in which the books are taken up, the worst possible. This has, however, nothing to do with the intrinsic claims of the enterprise to attention. The author has spent years in preparing the work which appears in this unpretending shape—and his general qualifications for a work so extensive and arduous are attested by his previous labours. In its completed state the work will form 'the Old and New Testaments in an English translation from the original languages, carefully revised, and compared with the principal Jewish, Catholic, and Protestant versions.' To each book a short, but neat and sensible Introduction is prefixed. There are not any notes or comments, but in the event of the work being completed, it is the intention of the author to furnish his authorities for the alterations adopted in supplementary volumes.

Mr. Barham speaks with due respect of the Authorized Version, and allows that 'the great doctrines and facts most important to man remain essentially the same in all the translations.' But, he urges, it is not the less true—

'that very numerous texts of Scripture require more exact translation than they have yet received, and the people should have the benefit of them. For to keep them needlessly in the dark touching Biblical versions, or to puzzle their minds with defective renderings, seems unwise and unfair. Let them by all means share in the advantages arising from the advancement of Biblical science and criticism, and not maintain a superstitious or bigoted attachment to false renderings, because sanctioned by use or custom, which may betray them into doubts and dangers. For a translation is no more, after all, than a translation; and in the five hundred translations of Scripture, among which the English Vulgate deserves a high place, the different renderings adopted are extremely numerous; so that in almost every text where I have differed from the English Vulgate, I found the former translators at issue; and whatever reading I adopted, though it might agree with some of them, was opposed by others.'

We shall not now enter into the critical merits of this version. It is enough to say that the specimens before us appear to be executed by a scholar fully competent for his task, which he is obviously executing with conscientious care and laudable painstaking. The renderings are generally judicious, the style solid; and Mr. Barham seems to have laboured much in obtaining a distinct and intelligible sense from texts which in many versions remain painfully unintelligible or obscure.

We

We give a specimen or two from the single book of Ecclesiastes, the argument of which difficult book is more clearly brought out in his version than, we think, in any other we have seen :—

‘ Ch. i. 18.—For in getting much wisdom much care is requisite; and he that would increase knowledge must also increase toil.

‘ Ch. ii. 10.—And what my eyes desired I kept not from them; for my heart sought joy in all my labour, and this was my object in all my toil.

‘ Ch. iii. 11.—He hath made everything beautiful in its season, and he hath set eternity in man’s heart; therefore shall not man seek out the work that God maketh from the beginning to the end?

‘ Ch. iii. 12.—I know that there is nothing better for man than to rejoice in doing good in his life; yea, let every one who would eat and drink show forth the good in all his labour.

‘ Ch. iii. 20.—And I saw there was nothing better for man than to increase happiness by his works; because this is his present portion, whatever he may come to see in his future existence.’

Lectures on Medical Missions. Edinburgh: Sutherland and Knox.
Pp. 348.

THIS is a book written chiefly by medical men on the subject of religion, but on a department of that subject on which they are well qualified to write—the peculiar facilities conferred by the medical profession for advancing the cause of Christian truth. The contents are—a Prefatory Essay, by Professor Alison; an Introductory Lecture, by Professor Miller; and the subjects of the following Lectures are—The Importance of Medical Missions, by the Rev. W. Swan; Qualifications, by W. Browne, Esq.; Duties, by the Rev. J. Watson; Sacredness, by N. Wilson; and Responsibilities attaching to the Profession of Medicine, by Dr. Coldstream. The lecturers are all medical men, with two exceptions.

Most cordially do we commend the volume, and feel assured that the happiest results would flow from its extensive circulation, especially among young men commencing the study of medicine. All the Lectures are excellent—those of Professor Miller and Drs. Wilson and Coldstream appear to us peculiarly so; while that of Mr. Swan, lately Missionary in Siberia, conveys a vast amount of useful information regarding the field at present occupied. We might select a host of truly eloquent passages, but must refer the reader to the book itself for them. The Christian minister will find here many valuable hints, which he may turn to account in the discharge of professional duty; and the private Christian can hardly fail to derive both pleasure and profit from these pages, especially the notices, by Dr. Coldstream, of men who were as distinguished for their piety as for their professional eminence.

As a specimen, we present the following summary, from the pen of Professor Miller :—

‘ We are thankful to say that we can point to the *actual success of medical missions in recent years*—the best of all arguments in favour of their efficiency. It is not the untried experiment of yesterday of which we speak. At this time there are about forty medical missionaries labouring in various fields. In Syria, whence the system first sprung; scattered through all Asia; in Polynesia; in Africa; among
the

the savage tribes of America. In God's providence, they seem to have found wide doors specially opened for their entrance. As medical men, they have found "access to communities and families in heathen lands, where the mere evangelist is not permitted to enter."^b "He who is a physician is pardoned for being a Christian; religious and national prejudices disappear before him; all hearts and harems are opened; and he is welcomed as if he were carrying to the dying the elixir of immortality. He, more than any one else, possesses the *mollia temporis fundi*."^c In the wilds of the Assyrian mountains, Dr. Asabel Grant, "armed with his needle for the removal of cataract, forced mountain-passes" which the sword could not command; and "amidst ferocious warriors won his way to their homes and their hearts. On account of his professional skill he was enabled to traverse in safety regions heretofore untrodden by civilised man—where inevitable death met the ordinary traveller, and in whose defiles an army would perish in attempting to effect a forcible entrance."^d In Damascus, "where all other Franks were grossly insulted and pelted with stones, Dr. Thomson was allowed to pass unmolested."^e A missionary, of thirty years' standing in India, has declared, that "but for the attention he was at some pains to render the sick, he knew not how he could have gained the confidence and ultimately the affection of the natives."^f Mr. Zerstmann, "by the exertion of his medical skill amongst the people (at Jerusalem), was the means of bringing large numbers of the Jews to listen again to Christianity, after they had entirely withdrawn themselves, at the command of the rabbis."^g In Siam, Dr. Bradley introduced vaccination, and became something more than the Jenner of an empire of four millions. In Ceylon, Dr. Scudder, by his wonderful healings, eclipsed the great idol Corduswammy; and, as in Lystra of old, they sought to worship him as a god.^h In China, progress has been great, and promises almost unlimited increase. In 1820, Dr. Livingston established a small hospital at Macao; in 1827 he was followed by Mr. Colledge; and to both of these British Medical Missionaries, "the sick, the maimed, and the blind resorted in crowds." In 1835, Dr. Parker, from America, settled in Canton, and to him "patients of all ranks flocked from all quarters." Other labourers have joined since. Now the applicants for relief are counted by thousands; and, true to the apostolic plan, while they are "healed of all manner of disease," they have also "the Gospel preached unto them." So bright is the prospect of success in that vast country, that we find one of the missionaries thus expressing himself:—"I have no hesitation in stating it as my solemn conviction, that, as yet, no medium of contact and of bringing the people under the sound of the Gospel, and within the use of other means of grace, can compare with the facilities afforded by medical missionary operations."ⁱ Nearer home, the labours of Dr. Halley, in Madeira, have proved so signally triumphant as to awaken the fiercest rage of the adversary; and the very expulsion of the missionary and his converts from the island stands recorded as the measure of his faithfulness and success.^j—Pp. 35-38.

^b Macgowan, p. 20.

^c Douglas on Missions.

^d Macgowan, p. 24.

^e Third An. Report of Ed. Med. Miss. Soc., p. 19.

^f Presb. Review, No. XII., p. 368.

^g Address to Med. Stud. by Ed. Med. Miss. Soc., 1842, p. 16.

^h Macgowan, pp. 24, 25.

ⁱ Fourth Annual Report, p. 29.

BIBLICAL INTELLIGENCE.

PENSION ON THE CIVIL LIST TO DR. KITTO.—At the request of a valued friend and frequent Contributor to the 'Journal of Sacred Literature,' who supposes the fact will be one of special interest to most of its readers, we venture to state that the 'Mr. John Kitto, M.D.,' to whom, according to the announcement in the 'Times' of December 23, Her Majesty has been pleased, on the recommendation of Lord John Russell, to grant a pension of 100*l.* a-year, is no other than their old friend and servant whose name and designation appear at the front of this Journal. As this grant is not only of important personal concernment to the recipient, but is a valuable indication of the disposition which exists in high places to recognise the claims of a branch of literature which has not hitherto been much encouraged by governments, we think it right to append a copy of the letter from the Premier, in which this mark of consideration was made known to Dr. Kitto:—

SIR,

Pembroke Lodge, Dec. 17, 1850.

I HAVE much pleasure in informing you that the Queen has directed that a grant of 100*l.* a-year should be made to you from Her Majesty's Civil List, on account of your useful and meritorious literary works.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

J. RUSSELL.

DR. TREGELLES' GREEK AND LATIN NEW TESTAMENT.—We have been gratified with the sight of a specimen of this work, in which many of our readers take great interest. The size is small quarto. The centre of the page is occupied with the Greek text, in a fine bold type. The great labour with which this text has been provided—the many years the learned Editor has spent upon it, and his frequent journeys for the collation of manuscripts, are well known to our readers. The text is flanked on the right hand by the Latin version of Jerome, from the text of the Codex Amiatinus, while on the left margin parallel references are given, with the notation of the Greek MSS., so as to exhibit at once what MSS. contain the part in question. In the specimen before us, from the Gospel of Matthew, a considerable portion of the page is occupied by foot notes, arranged in three columns. They contain the statement of various readings, showing what MSS. and versions support, and what oppose each reading. The early fathers are also particularly cited on each side.

Dr. Tregelles is to be congratulated on the success in devising an arrangement which makes all these matters clear to the eye. We cannot doubt the circulation of specimens, which we understand to be intended, will secure adequate support for an undertaking so invaluable to every student of God's word, and so eminently creditable to the Biblical scholarship of this country.

DR. DAVIDSON'S INTRODUCTION.—We are glad to learn that the third volume of this important work is in the press. It will be a larger volume than the other two; and from the peculiar interest of many of the questions which arise in the portion of Scripture to which it is devoted, its appearance will be anxiously expected by students in sacred literature. It will, we understand, be out in the spring.

CHRONOLOGY OF JUDGES.—At a recent meeting of the Syro-Egyptian Society

* As there is a Doctor of Medicine of the same surname, the correction is of some use for identification. In the same notification it is stated that Dr. Kitto is 'deaf and dumb.' This is not the fact. The readers of the *Lost Senses* know that, although entirely deaf, he, by great and persevering efforts, recovered in a great measure the use of speech, which at one time seemed to be nearly lost.

(as reported in the *Athenæum*, No. 1204), Mr. W. Sharpe read a paper 'On the Chronology of the Book of Judges.' Mr. Sharpe pointed out on the map the several nations who attacked the Israelites after the death of Joshua, and the extent of country that each conquered. His aim was to prove that the several invasions mentioned in the book were not all in succession, but that probably they took place in part at the same time. If all the intervals of time mentioned in the history are considered as successive, and added up together, they bring about 390 years between Joshua and Samuel. But, in Mr. Sharpe's view, the whole took place in 150 years; and this, he argued, agrees with the genealogies in which Moses is fourth from Jacob, and Jesse, the contemporary of Samuel, fourth in descent from that patriarch. Mr. Sharpe thus placed Joshua's death at about B.C. 1250, and the going forth out from Egypt under Moses at about B.C. 1300.

Mr. Black, admitting that there must be some synchronical events among those recorded in the book of Judges, inasmuch as the sum total of the times stated therein exceeded the period that could be allowed for the events in the general scale of chronology; still he urged that the excess was not so great as Mr. Sharpe considered it to be, and insisted that the period of 480 years, stated in 1 Kings vi. 1, as having elapsed between the Exodus and the foundation of Solomon's Temple, ought not to be explained away on the mere supposition that the descent of David from Judah presented too few generations. Mr. Black considered that it was more likely that some unworthy name or names had been omitted in the genealogy (according to Jewish custom), than that so important a date as that of the foundation of the Temple should be erroneous. He rejected Paul's alleged period of 450 years, in Acts xiii. 20, as too loose a statement, and too uncertain a statement to be relied upon for the support of the larger chronology, or even to be allowed to embarrass the subject; but he pointed out a much stronger confirmation of 480 years in the speech of Jephthah (Judges xi. 26), who declared that in his time the Israelites had been possessed of the country eastward of the Jordan 300 years; whereas Mr. Sharpe's theory allows no more than half of the time for the events of the whole book.

The long expected reprint of the English Version of the Scriptures, made from the Latin Vulgate by Wycliffe and his followers, has just appeared in four quarto volumes. It is from the Oxford University Press, and has been produced under the able editorship of the Rev. John Forshall, Secretary of the British Museum, and Sir Frederic Madden, Keeper of the Manuscripts in the same institution. We trust to be enabled to make a full report of it in the next number of the *Journal of Sacred Literature*.

TETRAQLOT PENTATEUCH, IN HEBREW, SAMARITAN, CHALDEE, AND SYRIAC.—This is the title of a work now far advanced in the printing, and about to be published by Mr. Robert Young, an enterprising bookseller in Edinburgh. We know so much of the great difficulty of gaining an adequate circulation for really learned works on Biblical criticism, that we gladly use all our influence to further the efforts of our fellow-labourers in this department of literature. This undertaking is to contain the following texts of the Pentateuch:—the Hebrew, the Chaldaeo-Samaritan Version, the Chaldaeo Version of Onkelos, the Peschito Syriac. These are all arranged on the *interlinear* system, so that a comparison of these valuable critical helps, with the Hebrew text, is obtained at a glance. We need not point out in this brief notice the great use which may be made of such a work as this, but hope to return to the subject when the first volume, to contain *Genesis*, is completed. Our present object is to call the attention of our readers to the fact that such a valuable critical help is now undertaken, and that the names of subscribers are solicited by the publisher. The proof sheets are revised by the Rev. John Duncan, LL.D., Professor of Hebrew and Oriental languages, New College, Edinburgh.

DR. TRAILL'S JOSEPHUS.—The publication of this work is at length resumed. We have before us the first number of the new volume—the preface to which contains a short notice of the late Dr. Traill, with an account of the state of the work at the time of his death. The long time during which the work has been suspended is not well accounted for; but it is stated that the whole of the translation now in course

course of publication has undergone a renewed and thorough revision—first by the Rev. W. Trollope, and then ‘by an accomplished member of the University of Cambridge,’ who has also read the sheets as they passed through the press. The graphic illustrations, after the faithful pencil of Mr. Tipping, are still of great interest and value. We regret to gather that, after the lapse of so much time, nothing more is promised than the completion of the *Jewish War*—though it is admitted that Dr. Traill had at the time of his death made considerable progress with the *Antiquities* and the two books against Apion.

Mr. Farrer, translator of Neander’s *Monograph of Theobald Thamer*, in the ninth number of this *Journal*, is about to produce *Memorials* of the late Professor Neander, translated from the German.

The Messrs. Seeleys announce a *Student’s Theological Manual*, containing the *History of the Canon, Theological Evidences, Biblical Antiquities, Old and New Testament History, Church History, Doctrine and Prophecy*, by George Henry Preston, of St. Bees College, Cumberland. This promises to be useful if well executed, and if the subjects are not too numerous for a really useful manual.

THE BRITISH MUSEUM.—The famous collection of Hebrew works known by the title of ‘The Michael Collection,’ recently purchased by the British Museum, amounts to about 5000 volumes. They are now in progress of being classified on a system which deserves to be adopted even by the private collectors of libraries. The several departments of Theology, Philosophy, Poetry, History, etc., are each represented by a peculiar colour of binding. Each department being again classed into certain subdivisions, the respective subdivision is made recognisable by the special colour of the lettering label. The variety of colours is not merely a great help in finding the desired volume, but is also a great relief to the eye—the monotony of uniform bindings being thus obviated.—*Athenæum*.

The fifth volume of Dr. Olshausen’s *Commentary on the New Testament (Kommentar über d. N. Test.)* is in the press. It is edited by Dr. A. Ebrard and Dr. Wiesinger.

In the *Publishers’ Circular* for December 16 there is a list of ONE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY publications on the Papal question, issued from the press in the course of one month.

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS.

ENGLISH.

Bagster’s *New Blank-Paged Bible*. Printed upon Writing Paper, with the alternate pages left blank, and neatly ruled with blue lines; with Index, &c.

Bather (Archd.)—*Sermons on Old Testament Histories*. 8vo. pp. 348.

Beaven (J.)—*Elements of Natural Theology*. 12mo. pp. 246.

Blackburn (Rev. J.)—*Nineveh; its Rise and Ruin, as illustrated by Ancient Scriptures and Modern Discoveries: a Course of Lectures delivered at Claremont Chapel, London*. 12mo. pp. 246.

Bloomfield (Dr. S. T.)—*Additional Annotations, Critical, Philological, and Explanatory, on the New Testament; being a Supplemental Volume to the Greek Testament, with English Notes*. 8vo. pp. 458.

Bracebridge (W. H.)—*Some Remarks on Divine Revelation, in general, and on the Mysterious Language of Prophecy; with a Synopsis of the Apocalyptic Visions*. 8vo. (Warwick).

Cumming (Rev. Dr. J.)—*Prophetic Studies, or Lectures on the Book of Daniel*. 12mo. pp. 516.

Dallas

- Dallas (Rev. A.)—Introduction to Prophetical Researches; being a brief Outline of the Divine Purpose concerning the World, as it may be gathered from Holy Scripture. Post 8vo. pp. 139.
- De Wette (W. M. L.)—Critical and Historical Introduction to the Canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament. Translated and enlarged by Theodore Parker. 2 vols. royal 8vo. 2nd edit. pp. 570.
- Dick (A. C.)—A Dissertation on Church Polity. 12mo. pp. 216.
- Dwight (Rev. H. G. O.)—Christianity Revived in the East; or, a Narrative of the Work of God among the Armenians of Turkey. Post 8vo. pp. 290.
- Gilfillan (G.)—The Bards of the Bible. 8vo. pp. 366.
- Goyder (Rev. T.)—Spiritual Reflections for Every Day in the Year. 2 vols. 32mo. pp. 986.
- Greek Church (The), a Sketch. 12mo. pp. 125.
- Hambleton (Rev. J.)—Holy Scriptures considered as to their Object, Authority, Uses, and Sufficiency. 12mo. pp. 192.
- Hammond (H.)—A Paraphrase and Annotations upon the Books of the Psalms, briefly explaining the difficulties thereof. New edition by the Rev. Thomas Brancker, M.A. 2 vols. 8vo. pp. 906.
- Hobson (Rev. S.)—What mean ye by this Service? The Question discussed in the Trial of George Herbert, Richard Hooker, Charles Stimeon, Reginald Heber, and Thomas Scott, on the Charge of Heresy. 8vo. pp. 222.
- Holy Scriptures (The), their Origin, Progress, Transmission, Corruptions, and True Character. 18mo. pp. 180.
- Hooker (R.)—The Works of that learned and judicious Divine, Mr. Richard Hooker; with an Account of his Life and Death. By Isaac Walton. New edit. 2 vols. 8vo. pp. 840.
- Idumæa; with a Survey of Arabia and the Arabians. Pp. 192. Religious Tract Society's Monthly Vol. (Vol. 61.)
- Jowett (Rev. W.)—Scripture Characters from the New Testament; comprising the Life and Doctrine of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Acts and Writings of His Apostles. 12mo. pp. 280.
- Kitto (Dr. J.)—Daily Bible Illustrations; being original Readings for a Year on Subjects from Sacred History, Biography, Geography, Antiquities, and Theology; especially designed for the Family Circle. Vol. III., Samuel, Saul, and David. July—September. 12mo. pp. 430.
- Lessons on the Metals of the Bible. By the Author of 'Scriptural Instruction.' 18mo. (Bath.) pp. 118.
- Newton (B. W.)—The Prophetic System of Mr. Elliott and Dr. Cumming considered. Extracted from the first Series of Aids to Prophetic Enquiry. Fcp. 8vo. pp. 60.
- Olshausen (H.) Biblical Commentary on the Gospels and on the Acts of the Apostles. From the German. Vol. IV. Edinburgh. 8vo. pp. 632.
- Overton (Rev. C.)—The Expository Preacher; or, St. Matthew's Gospel practically Expounded. Vol. I. 8vo. pp. 580.
- Owen.—The Works of John Owen, D.D. Edited by the Rev. W. H. Gould. Vol. I. 8vo. pp. 616.
- Rig-Veda Sanhita, a collection of ancient Hindu Hymns, constituting the first Ashtaka, or book, of the Rig-Veda, the oldest authority for the religious and social institutions of the Hindus. Translated from the original Sanscrit by H. H. Wilson, M.A., F.R.S., etc. 8vo.
- Sabbath (The Christian) considered in its various Aspects. By Ministers of different Denominations; with a Preface by the Hon. and Rev. Baptist W. Noel. 12mo. pp. 478.
- Stephen (Sir J.)—Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography. 2 vols. 8vo. pp. 634.
- Stodart (Rev. W.)—The Bible explained in a Series of Questions and Answers. Fcp. 8vo.
- Sumner (Archbishop)—A Practical Exposition of St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians, Timothy, Titus, Philemon, and to Hebrews; in the form of Lectures. 8vo. pp. 536.

Wycliffe's

Wycliffe's Bible.—The Holy Bible; containing the Old and New Testaments, with the Apocryphal Books in the earliest English Versions, made from the Latin Vulgate, by John Wycliffe and his Followers. Edited by the Rev. Josiah Forshall, F.R.S., &c., and Sir Fred. Madden, K.H., F.R.S. 4 vols. royal 4to.

FOREIGN.

- Alt (J. K. W.)**—Predigten über d. neugewählten epistol. Texte Jahrg. 1850. Vol. I. 8vo. Hamburg.
- Audin**—Histoire de la vie, des ouvrages et des doctrines de Calvin. 5ème édition, revue, corrigée et augmentée. 2 vols. 12mo.
- Bauer (B.)**—Kritik der Evangelien und Geschichte ihres Ursprungs. Vol. I. 8vo. Berlin.
- Bénard (l'Abbé)**—Histoire de la Révélation. 3 vols. 12mo.
- Bender (F.)**—Geschichte der Waldenser. 8vo. (Map.) Ulm.
- Bengellii (J. A.)**—Gnomon Novi Testamenti, Edit. III, tertio recusa adjuo. J. Stendel. 2 vols. 8vo.
- Böttiger (C. A.)**—Ideen zur Kunst Mythologie. Vol. II. 8vo. Leipzig.
- Braun (Dr. E.)**—griechische Mythologie. Vol. I. 8vo. Gotha.
- Capefigue**—Les quatre premiers Siècles de l'Eglise Chrétienne. Vol. II. 8vo.
- Chastel (Etienne)**—Histoire de la Destruction du Paganisme dans l'Empire d'Orient. 8vo.
- Félice (G. de)**—Histoire des Protestants de France, depuis l'origine de la Réformation jusqu'au temps présent. 8vo.
- Forbiger (A.)**—Kurzer Abriss der alten Geographie. 8vo. Leipzig.
- Fricke (Ph. G. A.)**—Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte. Vol. I. 8vo. Leipzig.
- Gners (E.)**—Histoire abrégée de l'Eglise de Jésus-Christ principalement pendant les Siècles du Moyen Age; rattachée aux grands traits de la Prophétie. 2nd edit. 8vo.
- Guettée (l'Abbé)**—Histoire de l'Eglise de France, composée sur les Documents Originaux et Authentiques. Vol. V. 8vo.
- Hahn (H. A.)**—Commentar üb. das Buch Hiob. 8vo. (Berlin).
- Hengstenberg (E. W.)**—Die Offenbarung des heil. Johannes f. solche die in der Schrift forschen erläutert. Vol. II. Part I. 8vo. Berlin.
- Hilgenfeld (A.)**—Die Glossolalie in der alten Kirche, in dem Zusammenhang der Geistesgaben u. d. Geisteslebens d. alten Christenthums. 8vo.
- Ideler (K. W.)**—Versuch einer Theorie des religiösen Wahnsinns. 2 Parts. 8vo. Halle.
- Jacobi (J. L.)**—Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte. Vol. I. 8vo. Berlin.
- Joinville (H. de)**—Méditations sur la Bible et les saints Evangiles. 8vo.
- Josephi, Flavii, Judaei, Opera omnia ad optimorum librorum fidem accurate edita. Editio stereot. VI. tomi. 16mo. Lips.**
- Juynboll (T. G.)**—Lexicon geographicum arabice. Fasc. 2. 8vo. Leyden.
- Köhler (H. K. E.)**—Scraps od. Abhandlungen betreff. das griech. u. röm. Alterthum. 2 vols. royal 8vo. Petersb.
- Lange (J. P.)**—Christliche Dogmatik. Vol. II.: Positive Dogmatik. Part I. 8vo. Heidelb.
- Luther (M.)**—Reformatiorische Schriften in chronologischer Folge, mit einer Biographie Luther's, hrg. von K. Zimmermann. 4 vols. 8vo. Darmstadt.
- Martensen (H.)**—Die christliche Dogmatik. Vol. II. 8vo. Kiel.
- Meier (E.)**—Der Prophet Jesaia erklärt. Vol. I. 8vo.

Meyer

- Meyer (H. A. W.)**—Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament XI Abth. Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus bearb. von J. E. Huther. 8vo. Göttingen.
- Mommson (T.)**—Ueber den Chronographen vom J. 354, m. e. Anh. üb. die Quellen der Chronik des Hieronymus. 4to. Leipzig.
- Naegelsbach (C. W. E.)**—Der Prophet Jeremias u. Babylon. Eine exegetisch-krit. Abhandlung. 8vo. Erlangen.
- Neander**—Zur Gedächtniss August. Neanders, 4 articles by Rauh, F. Strauss, Krummacher and Nitzsch. 8vo.
- Noack (Dr. L.)**—Das Mysterium des Christenthums, oder die Grundidee des ewigen Evangeliums. 8vo. Leipzig.
- Pascal**—Sa Vie et son Caractère, ses Ecrits et son Génie, par l'Abbé Maynard. 2 vols. 8vo.
- Pauli Epistola altera ad Timotheum graece.** Cum comment. ed. G. E. Leo. 8vo. Lipsiae.
- Philippi (F. A.)**—Commentar üb. den Brief Pauli an die Römer. 2 vols. 8vo. Erlang.
- Plutarch** über Isis u. Osiris, nach neuvergleichenen Handschriften m. Uebersetzung u. Erläuterung. hrag. v. G. Parthey. 8vo. Berlin.
- Samachscharii Lexicon arabicum-persicum ex codd. mss. lipsiensibus, oxoniensibus, vindobonensibus, et berolinensibus edidit atque indicem arabicum adiecit J. G. Wetzstein.** 4to. Lips.
- Schegg (P.)**—Der Prophet Isaias übersetzt u. erklärt. 2 vols. 8vo. Münch.
- Schuber (M.)** meine Pilgerreise üb. Rom. Griechenland u. Egypten durch die Wüste nach Jerusalem. Royal 8vo. Wien.
- Stier (R.)**—Jesaias, nicht Pseudo-Jesaias. Auslegung seiner Weissagung. Kap. 40—66: Nebst Einleitung wider die Pseudo-Kritik. Royal 8vo. Barm.
- Testamentum novum, Graece et Latine.** C. Lachmannus recensuit, P. Buttmannus Graecae lectionis auctoritates apposit. Tom. II. 8vo. Berol.
- Tobler (T.)**—Grundriss v. Jerusalem. Folio. St. Gall.
- Wichelhaus (J.)**—De Novi Testamenti versione syriaca antiqua quam Peschitho vocant libri quatuor. 8vo. (Halle.) Map.
- Wildenhahn (A.)**—Martin Luther. Kirchengeschichtliches Lebensbild aus dem ersten Zehntel der Reformation. 2 vols. 8vo. Leipz.
- Wolf (K. A.)**—Der erste Brief Johannis, in kirchl. Catechisationen. Part I. 8vo. Leipz.

. Although the names of the Contributors to this Journal are no longer given in connection with their articles, the publication still remains an organ for the discussion of subjects in Sacred Literature. The views advanced will thus necessarily vary, and are to be regarded as those of the several writers; the Editor not being held responsible for every opinion and argument, but only for the general adaptation of the articles to the design of the Journal.

THE
JOURNAL
OF
SACRED LITERATURE.

~~~~~  
NO. XIV.—APRIL, 1851.  
~~~~~

EGYPT.

1. *Egypt's Place in Universal History*: an Historical Investigation, in Five Books, by CHRISTIAN C. J. BUNSEN, D.Ph. & D.C.L. Translated from the German by Charles H. Cottrell, Esq., M.A. Vol. I. London. Longman and Co. 1848.
2. *Ancient Egypt under the Pharaohs*. By JOHN KENRICK, M.A. In two volumes, 8vo. London. B. Fellowes. 1850.
3. *The Monuments of Egypt; or, Egypt a Witness for the Bible*. By FRANCIS L. HAWKS, D.D., LL.D. New York: Putnam. London: Murray. 1850.
4. *Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians*. By Sir J. GARDNER WILKINSON, F.R.S. Three volumes. Murray. 1837.—Second Series. Two volumes. Murray. 1841.

It would appear at first sight paradoxical that a book, or collection of books, so old as the inspired Scriptures, should be receiving new elucidations in our own day. Although nearly eighteen hundred years have elapsed since the last of its authors lived and died, its treasures have not so far been investigated and brought to light but that much yet remains to be done. Moreover, during that period the mind of man has been most active in carrying on the inquiry. Every age has produced its commentators, its apologists, and its objectors. The truth has been sifted in every way by friend and by foe; and, indeed, no book that was not infallible in its authorship could have stood the test. A reason may be alleged why, in the midst of so much turmoil, literary and controversial, the real work of biblical interpretation has advanced so

slowly. Inquirers have not always seized the points which were tangible and capable of demonstration. Systems of theology have been framed to suit the current ideas of the period, and, in the attempt to reconcile Scripture with these systems, much laborious criticism has been wasted. It is to be hoped that the present age avoids that error. Investigation assumes a more useful form, being applied directly to ascertain and vindicate the integrity of the canon itself, and to substantiate those evidences, external as well as internal, which strengthen the authority of the sacred record and repel the assaults of infidel objectors. Among these evidences the labours of the traveller and the antiquarian claim especial notice. They have succeeded in throwing light on the Word of God which was unknown to their predecessors. The evidence afforded by the sculptures of Nineveh is wholly new. Those bas-reliefs and their inscriptions had slumbered underneath the sand of the desert for some five-and-twenty centuries, and came forth at last to bear testimony to the truth of God. The monuments of Egypt have reared their heads above ground, some of them emphatically so, and travellers of all ages and countries, from Herodotus and Diodorus to Lane, and Bunsen, and Rosellini, have looked and admired. It is remarkable, however, that the hieroglyphic inscriptions which they carry have defied interpretation till our own age. Œdipus made himself famous by guessing the Sphinx's riddle, but the riddles which abound in that same region, propounded in mystic characters on the walls, have vainly challenged an Œdipus to solve them till Young and Champollion, in recent days, formed out of the hieroglyphics a *phonetic* alphabet,* and gave to the world the historic lore which till then had been hidden. The result has been a far more distinct knowledge of Egypt and its traditions. That country has (to use the language of Chevalier Bunsen's title-page) acquired 'a place in universal history' which it did not previously occupy; and a knowledge of Egypt, be it observed, is a knowledge of a monarchy made most

* Humboldt remarks: 'According to the views which, since Champollion's great discovery, have prevailed more and more respecting the early conditions of the development of alphabetic writing, the Phœnician and all the Semitic written characters, though they may have been originally formed from pictorial writing, are to be regarded as a *phonetic alphabet*; i. e., as an alphabet in which the ideal signification of the pictured sign is wholly disregarded, and these signs or characters are treated exclusively as signs of sound.'—*Cosmos*, vol. ii. p. 126.

Between picture-writing and the electric-printing telegraph we may trace the progressive struggles of man to express to the eye the thoughts of his mind. Phonographic short-hand transfers simultaneously to paper the *sounds* uttered by a speaker, whether his language be understood or not. The telegraph, as we know, works irrespectively of time or distance. When the two are combined we shall have acquired a power of transmitting ideas beyond which we can at present form no conception.

prominent in Holy Writ, and therefore cannot but supply additional illustration to the historical Scriptures.

We may regard Egypt as a vast problem. Indeed, the studies connected with its solution have assumed the definite form of a science, to which the title of 'Egyptology' has been applied. It may thus be enunciated: given the existence of the land and its antiquities, monumental and dialectical, it is required to find additional links to the history of man. The data are alike copious and varied, they promise much information and invite research; the *quæsitæ* will involve questions of the deepest interest, and more particularly where the inspired histories of the Old Testament derive additional confirmation. The data, we say, are varied. The very position of the country awakens inquiry. It is situated at the junction of three continents, and, if we regard these divisions of the world as the respective colonies of Shem, Ham, and Japhet, we have in the land watered by the Nile an outpost in which the three divisions of mankind would continue to hold common intercourse. This suggests an antecedent probability that it would become the locale of the very earliest civilization. We may be prepared, also, to expect that this civilization would be long maintained. The theory is now gaining ground among thoughtful men, that barbarism is by no means the primitive condition of the race, but rather a degeneracy. War and slavery have ever been the most fatal agents of retrogression. Peace, on the other hand, and a moderate degree of liberty, have rapidly sufficed to develop a nation's resources, and call into existence those arts of human life which serve to perpetuate the history of the past. Egypt illustrates this principle. Its territory is small, but protected by its position. Its inhabitants, though in some instances warlike, appear to have cultivated the arts of peace. Its governments have avoided, in a great degree, aggressive warfare; and whilst, no doubt, they exerted a despotic power over their subjects, yet their sway was protective rather than tyrannical. And what has been the consequence? Egypt has not played so brilliant a part in the annals of mankind as its more warlike neighbours. It has never expanded into a wide empire, but it has prolonged its political existence over a greater period of time than they, and its monuments still rear their imperishable heads. The Assyrian, the Persian, the Macedonian, and the Roman empires all rose in succession upon the world's stage ere Egypt ceased to be governed by native rulers.

The existence, during so long a period, of a small territory near the point of junction of three continents as a civilized kingdom in itself awakens our interest. The monuments themselves add to the interest, and afford subject-matter, not only for specu-

lation, but research. The eagle-eye of Napoleon never overlooked any subject worthy of filling the mind of man. He regarded 'Egypt as a highway to Assyria.' In his dreams of an oriental empire the land of the seven-mouthed river occupied a prominent position. He saw that to command that little territory was to have the key of the east; that its acquisition would, in fact, give him a valuable *point d'appui* in any future expedition against British India. We must endeavour to picture to ourselves these gigantic conceptions of this conqueror, and we shall then be able to attach vast meaning to those words which he addressed to his army, 'Soldiers! from the top of those pyramids forty centuries look down upon you.' How his expedition failed we need not now relate. One thing it accomplished which concerns us; it opened out the stores of Egypt's antiquities; it filled the museums of Europe with hieroglyphics and sarcophagi; it brought to light the Rosetta stone, and altogether gave a stimulus to critical investigation which has thrown a flood of light on a subject hitherto sealed in obscurity.

The most prominent among the data of our problem are the hieroglyphics. Even a careless observer in any Egyptian museum will have seen depicted on mummy cases, tablets, sarcophagi, seals, ornaments, and utensils, in short, every article that has survived the wreck of time,—innumerable devices which look neither like alphabetic characters nor pictorial groups, but partake of the nature of both. Snakes, animals, and birds, men with human heads and men with heads of brutes, geometrical figures and representations of heavenly bodies, lotus leaves and papyrus plants, tools of artificers and domestic utensils, follow each other in unintelligible order, though arranged in something like straight ranks. These birds, beasts, and miscellaneous beings are the written history of Ancient Egypt, and, with the exception of the questionable fragments of Manetho that have been preserved by Josephus, and his lists of kings that have been handed down by Eusebius and Africanus, stand nearly alone; to these if we add what Herodotus learned from the Egyptian priests, we shall have little besides to guide us. The world has, in fact, been waiting till the present century for the magician who would draw aside the veil that concealed from our view the hidden meaning of those mysterious hieroglyphs. That solution has been found, as we have already hinted, and the higher problem is by so much nearer to an elucidation. These records, whether inscribed on tablets or written on papyri, have been remarkably preserved to us. There is no climate in the world so well adapted to perpetuate the labours of the sculptor and of the architect as that of Egypt; it may well be inferred, that God in his providence has intended

intended that the memorials of that country should be lasting. Their style of building, in which the pyramid entire or truncated is the leading feature, where strength far beyond what was necessary for practical purposes was secured by columns and supports of colossal proportions, where the arch was either unknown or deemed insecure, has caused their public edifices almost to defy the hand of time. Moreover, it was a peculiar result of their religious belief to bestow the greatest attention on the sepulchres of the dead. The body itself, as we all well know, was preserved by an elaborate process of embalming; it was ornamented in a style suited to the wealth of the departed, the tomb was furnished with objects to which he gave a preference in life, and its walls exhibited the record of his doings. It is this which has given us, far beyond what we might have expected, a close insight into the domestic life and manners of this early race. It is very doubtful whether these curiosities will be so effectually preserved in our glass-cases as they have been hitherto under a cloudless sky, or in a dry Egyptian sepulchre. The obelisk of Luxor, removed by the French to Paris, has already exhibited symptoms of decay in the damp atmosphere to which it has been transferred. It will be well to quote, in reference to this, some interesting remarks of Bunsen :—

‘ No nation of the earth has shown so much zeal and ingenuity, so much method and regularity in recording the details of private life as the Egyptians. Every year, month, and even day of their life, under this or that king, was specially noted down. No country in the world afforded greater natural facilities for indulging such a propensity than Egypt, with its limestone and granite, its dry climate, and the protection afforded by its deserts against the overpowering force of nature in southern zones. Such a country was adapted, not only for securing its monuments against dilapidation both above and below ground for thousands of years, but even for preserving them as perfect as the day they were erected. In the North, rain and frost corrode; in the South, the luxuriant vegetation cracks or obliterates the monuments of time. China has no architecture to bid defiance to thousands of years; Babylon had but bricks; in India the rocks can barely resist the wanton power of nature. Egypt is the monumental land of the earth, as the Egyptians are the monumental people of history.’—*Bunsen*, p. 31.

What are the quæsitæ of ‘Egyptological’ research? We hope to find an additional link in the chain of universal history, a fresh chapter in the records of our race. We must, however, forewarn our readers not to expect too much. It is not yet in any man’s power to submit to the world the lives of Egyptian sovereigns from Menes to Nectanebus II., the first and last of Manetho’s monarchs. No one can draw out a connected system of chronology,

logy, or even point out the parallelisms of Egyptian history with that of the Jewish and Assyrian States, at least antecedent to the time of Rehoboam. Something, however, is accomplished if our views of the old world are corrected or confirmed, if the testimony of Scriptural writers is corroborated, if our knowledge of ancient manners and customs is enriched. In short, the great Egyptian problem may be said to have received a threefold solution from its various investigators, to the respective branches of which, three writers, to whom we will now allude, have applied themselves.

In the first place there is the wide question of the original mutual relations of the human family coupling itself with that of the antiquity of civilization. To this Bunsen has applied himself, and, in his profound treatise, brings the evidence of Egyptian language and chronology to bear upon the point at issue. Mr. Kenrick, in a more humble way, is satisfied to record unostentatiously, but with the greatest clearness of arrangement, all that may be known as matter of fact concerning the country, its manners, laws, religion, and history. Dr. Hawks, the most popular writer of the three, asks whether Egypt may not be made a witness to the truth of the Bible. This question he has answered in a manner that is extremely interesting, and, so far as the data permit, satisfactory.

Chevalier Bunsen, in his investigation, enters upon ground which is hitherto to a great extent untrodden, and only to be explored, as we think, with the utmost caution. Most of our readers will be aware that the dynasties tabulated by Manetho, the Sebennyte priest, are thirty in number, and stretch back to dates which are heard of only in Chinese chronology. If these dynasties are allowed to be successive they make up in duration a period of more than five thousand three hundred years. Our great German investigator does not allow us to set Manetho aside with the hasty imputation of being fabulous. He would have the world's chronology an open question, and propounds, as one of the leading inquiries to which he has directed his attention—"Is the chronology of Egypt, as embodied in the dynasties of Manetho, capable of restoration wholly, or in part, by means of the monuments and the names of its kings?" It must be confessed that our old established notions of the date of the Flood, of the Call of Abraham, and of events of similar importance, will be very materially disturbed if the Egyptian priest is to be elevated into an authority. It is acknowledged that, subsequently to the building of Solomon's Temple, the Bible Chronology may be clearly ascertained. Now the dedication took place 1004 B.C., or in the three-thousandth year of the world. The date assigned to the Flood

Flood is 2348 B.C., consequently we have an interval of 1344 years between these two epochs, which is divided into three nearly equal intervals by the Call of Abraham and the Exodus of the Israelites. The 420 years duration of the first interval may be readily computed from Gen. xi. The second interval of 430 years is rendered familiar to us by the statement of St. Paul, Gal. iii. 17 :—‘ This, I say, that the covenant that was confirmed before of God, in Christ, the law which was *four hundred and thirty years* after cannot disannul that it should make the promise of none effect.’ Perhaps it may be conceded to those who would argue for the Egyptian chronology, that the intervals of time are not recorded consecutively in the book of Judges ; in other words, that we cannot easily affix dates to the periods at which successive rulers assumed the reins of power. But no amount of ingenuity will, from the Scriptural data, extend the entire interval from Joshua to Solomon much beyond that which we assign to it. We are accustomed also to form our ideas of chronology from the genealogical lists in the Gospels. From St. Matthew we learn that there were thrice fourteen generations from Abraham to Jesus Christ. From the Flood to the last king in Manetho’s list, we assign, according to the Scriptural chronology, about 2000 years ; the same, in fact, as the interval during which the forty-two generations succeeded each other. From Menes to Nectanebus we have, according to the varying statements of the dynastic lists, either 530 or 350 kings. Now this would give an average duration to the reigns of these monarchs quite within the limits of probability. In other words, the number of kings and the number of years harmonize. If, therefore, we attempt to meet the difficulty by supposing three or four to have been reigning at once, and that Thebes, Thinis, Memphis, and Tanis, were contemporaneous seats of sovereignty, we shall have too few kings, or assume their reigns to be of greater length than was probably the case. The question is necessarily beset with difficulties, and until it is thoroughly sifted, our perplexities are more increased than diminished by the hieroglyphical discoveries. The monuments have shown that the Pharaohs of the lists were not altogether fabulous beings. The names of Thothmes, and Amenophis, and Rameses, have been laboriously spelt out from the hieroglyphics. We can therefore not class the Sebennyte priest as a mere writer of myths, but must wait till we have gathered all the facts by which his claims can be investigated. In this respect post-Adamic chronology has a relation to scientific research not dissimilar to that which pre-Adamic has to the inquiries of geologists. Let us suspend our judgment for a time, assured that in each case the truth of the Bible will shine out more brightly than before. After
all

all it is to be borne in mind that the truths made most clear by the inspired volume are not those of science. It is quite possible that commentators may have been too eager to give positive interpretations to ambiguous suggestions of holy writ, to pretend, in short, that the Bible spoke more clearly than was its real intention. So thinks, at least, the learned author of 'Egypten Stelle.'

'As regards the Jewish computation of time, the study of Scripture had long convinced me that there is in the Old Testament no connected chronology prior to Solomon. All that now passes for a system of ancient chronology beyond that fixed point, is the melancholy legacy of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; a compound of intentional deceit and utter misconception of the principles of historical research. Egyptian history is the only one which possesses contemporary monuments of those primeval ages, and at the same time offers points of contact with the primitive tribes of Asia, especially the Jewish, from the latest up to the earliest times. It is here, if anywhere, that materials are to be gathered for the foundation of a chronology of the oldest history of nations.'—*Bunsen*. Preface, viii.

We are not prepared as yet to acknowledge the conclusions of the Chevalier with regard to the dates of Egyptian history. If, however, we make a surrender to him, we find that he has fresh demands. It is demonstrated from the monuments that when Menes, the first king of this very ancient series flourished, a state of no ordinary civilization had been established. The arts had made some progress, and language had been committed, if not to writing, at least to a form in which it could be transmitted to subsequent generations. We are therefore to consider that Menes reigned over no new people; that they had been some time in existence; that, in short, the colonization of Egypt dates much further back than Manetho's royal lists. This is a formidable demand upon us. All that we can suggest is, that we should wait patiently. His Excellency has only given to the English public one volume at present, we shall look anxiously for the next. We believe that he is a candid investigator. No one can fail to admire the critical accuracy with which every atom of evidence is weighed, or the patience with which every witness is heard. He has a strong leaning to that school of German scholars who take nothing for granted, who are critics in the strictly etymological sense; sitting in *judgment* on every preconceived notion, or every new fact. We repeat it, that this mode of proceeding requires caution when dealing with Scripture. If the tablets give evidence of some five hundred kings, we shall not immediately dispute, though we may modify our inferences; but if the question resolves itself into that of the relative authority of Moses and Manetho, the Seben-
nyte,

nyte, we suspect, must give way. We should much like to glance at the dissertations on hieroglyphics and their interpretation, given in this masterly work, but for the present we can but recommend them to the reader's attention. On this point we believe Chevalier Bunsen to be *the* authority.

The second solution of the Egyptian problem is that given in Mr. Kenrick's work. He answers the question, Whether, from the surviving monuments, inscriptions, and antiquities, we can gather any information concerning the social and political condition of the people who clustered of old on the banks of the Nile? To accomplish this task it was not necessary to do more than cull from the existing authorities all that is essential to a history of Egypt. Bunsen takes a far loftier flight. He brings a more creative genius to bear. He strikes out a path for himself, and speaks with the confident tone of a man who has thought long and intently upon the subject under consideration. It is otherwise with Mr. Kenrick. His merit is that of a diligent reader, an accurate translator, a methodical arranger. We have seldom read a book of the same magnitude in which the author played a less conspicuous part. He humbly desires to make his reader acquainted with the records of Herodotus and Diodorus, and the results of the investigations of Rosellini and Wilkinson, and then is satisfied. It must be confessed that this detracts from the interest of a work. We always delight in the enthusiasm of one who writes at first hand. We like to sympathize in his labours and sufferings, and where he is a man of independent thought, we can listen to his speculations either with a view to concord or combat. It is not very exciting to be told that a certain group of hieroglyphics means 'Ptolemy,' but when we follow the labours of those who first examined the Rosetta Stone, when we hear of their mistakes as well as their more happy guesses, then, even if we are led no further than to discover the phonetic value of some twelve or fourteen signs, we are duly rewarded. This illustrates the principle by virtue of which the writings of an investigator awaken interest more than those of a compiler. Sir Gardner Wilkinson's five volumes of antiquarian investigation become, in comparison, light reading. Now, in making these remarks, we do not desire to detract from the merits of 'Ancient Egypt.' We do not hesitate to say that it contains information on this interesting subject, arranged in a clear and concise form, which could be obtained in no other way than by consulting the numerous authorities which the author has so copiously used. It is not only the best history of Egypt which we possess, but, taking into consideration the recent light that has been thrown upon the subject, and the
obsolete

obsolete character of all former histories, we may say that it is the only one.^b

We say that Mr. Kenrick deals with the social and political question. To this we may for a moment direct our attention. The manners of a people have always been closely affected by the geographical nature of their country. Physical geography has many links with the social condition of men. It is almost possible to take a blank map of the world, and, as the eye wanders from country to country, to give a rude outline of its political condition from considerations derived exclusively from its position and territorial conformation. The irregular outline of Greece and its adjacent Archipelago suggests facility of maritime intercourse and the antecedent probability of colonial enterprise and free political institutions. Italy has an extended line of coast, and the country itself occupies a central position between Europe, Africa, and the East. It was the fitting centre of a wide conquering empire. England's insular position, with its bracing climate, has given a lasting impress to the Anglo-Saxon race which follows it in all its ramifications in the Old World and the New. Where the eye, wandering over the map, sees vast tracts unwashed by the ocean, untriven by those flowing streams which carry the world's riches on their bosoms, we may suspect ignorance if not barbarism, despotic institutions if not slavery. Russia and Poland, and still more, Central Africa, will illustrate this. The earliest colonisation was always guided by the course of large rivers. In hot climates there is no fertility far away from their banks. The scene of man's pristine happiness was watered by four streams, and the land, irrigated by the Tigris and the Euphrates, were, subsequently to the flood, the cradle of the human race. The next country to which the post-diluvians directed their steps was one in which the river was more emphatically still the attracting influence. What were Egypt without the Nile? A blank desert, untrodden save by the lion or the jackal, except when the caravan, with its slow train of camels, threads its way from the Red Sea, or the Mediterranean, to some inland oasis.

Mr. Kenrick says:—

‘The Nile holds a far more important relation to the country through which it flows than any other river of the world. The courses of the Rhine, the Danube, or the Rhone, are only lines on the surface of Germany or France; the valleys of the Euphrates and the Tigris were a very small part of the dominions of the Assyrian and Babylonian kings;

^b It is necessary to advise Mr. Kenrick's readers to put themselves in possession of Rosellini's plates, or Sir Gardner Wilkinson's illustrations. He will find such an addition of importance, as Mr. K.'s pictorial representations are confined exclusively to the cloth cover.

but the banks of the Nile are Egypt and Nubia. To live below the cataracts and to drink of its waters was, according to the oracle of Ammon, to be an Egyptian. Upwards or downwards, it is through the valley of the Nile that civilisation and conquest have taken their course.'—*Ancient Egypt*, vol. i. p. 4.

A striking peculiarity of this remarkable river is, that for more than a thousand miles of the latter part of its progress towards the Mediterranean, it has no tributaries. We might almost wonder that its waters are not absorbed or evaporated, seeing that there are no rains to compensate the waste. The river, indeed, appears to widen near the Pyramids, but this is explained by the circumstance that its channel is no longer straitened by the double range of limestone hills, which for a considerable distance form its banks. The waters are at liberty to form new channels. These constitute what have been termed by the ancients the *seven* mouths of the Nile. A never ceasing process, however, which is well understood by the inhabitants of New Orleans from their experience of the Mississippi, and indeed by all who are familiar with the mouths of great rivers, has reduced these seven to *three*, the Pelusiatic, or eastern arm, the Canopic, or western, and the Sebenyitic, which last is, in fact, the Nile as it continues most nearly in the direction of the undivided stream. The alluvial deposit—for this is the process alluded to—has at the same time raised the entire surface of the Delta. Sir Gardner Wilkinson shows that this rise is observable along the whole extent of the river from the first cataract to the mouth, but that, as might naturally be expected, the variation is less rapid nearer the sea. Where the inundation is more widely spread the mud is necessarily distributed in thinner layers. In consequence of the regularity of these inundations each locality has an increase of soil which, in an aggregate of years, obeys a law tolerably definite. At Elephantine, the land has been raised about 9 feet in 1700 years, at Thebes about 7, and so on, gradually decreasing towards the sea. This curious fact supplies an unexpected time-register to the monuments—given a certain depth of alluvial soil at the base of an obelisk or sphinx above the original ground line—the rate of deposit for that locality being known, an approximate guess may be made of the date of building. The same author remarks, that around the base of the obelisk at Heliopolis, erected by Osirtasen I. about 1700 years before our era, the alluvial soil has accumulated to the height of 5 feet 10 inches; and comparing this with Elephantine, we shall find that a monument placed there at the same period would have been buried to the depth of about 19 feet.

This peculiarity of the Nile is indirectly connected with one still more striking. The want of tributary streams and the consequent

sequent absence of the cooling influence of evaporation over the surface of the country raises the temperature of the air, and those regions which are beyond the reach of the periodical inundations become vast desert tracts which radiate the heat shed by a nearly tropical sun in its scorching beams. Consequently, the vapours which are gathered from the expansive waters of the Mediterranean are carried over the land by the cold currents which rush in to supply the partial vacuum at the equator, without depositing by condensation one particle of moisture. 'On the family of Egypt,' says the Prophet Zechariah, 'there is no rain.' And this appears to be the explanation of the phenomenon. Vapours pass over the land abundantly, but the heat radiated by its surface is too great to allow of condensation. There is a time of the year, however, in which the north wind blows with greater vehemence, the vapours rise from the Mediterranean in greater abundance, and in Abyssinia the waters fall. This is just about the summer solstice. Within the tropic of Cancer, in some spot unknown to Herodotus or Pliny, and undiscovered by Mungo Park or Bruce, and which is still an unsolved problem, the watershed of the Nile exists. The mountains are known whose rills and torrents constitute the volume of waters.^c On the cold summits of these elevations the clouds impinge, which had refused to deposit their contents on the thirsty land over which they had travelled. The vapour is instantly changed into an aqueous form, and almost to the very day on which the sun is vertical on the tropic, showers descend, which may remind us of the abundance of rain whose

^c The recent discoveries in the interior of Africa of the missionaries Krapf and Rebmann may perchance prepare the way for a full solution of this ancient problem. On the 9th of May, 1848, Mr. Rebmann saw, in south lat. 4°, east long. 36°, a *snow mountain*, which cannot be less than sixteen thousand feet high. His statement, which has been called in question by certain European men of science, has been subsequently corroborated by Dr. Krapf, whose description exhibits too many 'undesigned coincidences' with that of his brother missionary to leave room for further doubt as to the accuracy of their several accounts. Mr. Rebmann says: 'The mountains of Jagga gradually rose more distinctly to our sight. At about ten o'clock (I had no watch with me) I observed something remarkably white on the top of a high mountain, and first supposed that it was a very white cloud, in which supposition my guide also confirmed me; but having gone a few paces more, I could no longer rest satisfied with that explanation; and while I was asking my guide a second time whether that white thing was indeed a cloud, and scarcely listening to his answer that yonder was a cloud, but what that white was he did not know, but supposed it was *coldness*, the most delightful recognition took place in my mind of an old well-known European guest called *snow*. All the strange stories we had so often heard about the gold and silver mountain Kilimandjaro, in Jagga, supposed to be inaccessible on account of evil spirits, which had killed a great many of those who had attempted to ascend it, were now at once rendered intelligible to me, as of course the extreme cold, to which the poor natives are perfect strangers, would soon chill and kill the half-naked visitors.' See *Narrative of a Journey to Jagga*, by Rev. J. Rebmann, *Church Missionary Intelligencer*, May, 1849.

sound reached the ears of Elijah of old. The waters rush down the mountain sides, and the sacred river gradually swells, its turgid waters charged with the red earth that is a few weeks later deposited over the breadth of Egypt. Such is the most reasonable explanation of a phenomenon so remarkable, of such vital importance to the inhabitants of the land, and at the same time one that has received such contradictory solutions.

Mr. Kenrick gives an interesting sketch of the various blunders of the ancients in reference to this question :—

‘ It was natural that an inhabitant of Greece, accustomed to the rivers of his own country, swollen in summer by the melting of snow upon the mountains, should attribute the rise of the Nile to the same cause. Such was the opinion of Anaxagoras, adopted by Æschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides, but rejected by Herodotus on the ground that no snow could fall in the climate of Ethiopia. Thales supposed that there was no real increase of the waters of the Nile, but that the Etesian winds, blowing from the north in summer full upon its mouth, prevented their discharge into the sea, and threw them back upon the low grounds of Egypt. This is a real cause, but not adequate to explain the whole effect. Democritus, and probably Hecatæus, attributed its rise to its connection with the ocean, which was conceived to flow round the south of Libya, and thought its waters had been sweetened by long exposure to the sun. Probably some vague notion of the tides of the ocean was combined in their minds with that of the origin of the Nile, to explain its periodical swelling. Another explanation attributed the increase of the waters to an exudation from the earth, saturated with condensed moisture during the winter, which the summer heat expanded and set free. Herodotus himself supposed that he had explained the phenomenon by the remark, that the rivers in Southern Libya were necessarily lowest in winter, when the sun was vertical over those regions, though this offered no solution of the overflow in summer. The true cause, the rainy season in Ethiopia, was first assigned by Agatharchides of Cnidus, in the second century B.C.’—*Kenrick’s Ancient Egypt*, vol. i. p. 82:

The periodical inundations of the Nile obviously connect themselves with the pursuits of the Egyptians. We are at once prepared to find an agricultural population extending along its banks, characterized by ingenuity in the arts of peace, not given to maritime adventure, yet capable of defensive warfare. Indeed the fertilising river made the task of the agriculturist an easy one. Herodotus was struck with the facility with which the Egyptian husbandman obtained his crop. He had but to wait for the rise of the waters, cut channels and furrows by which his portion of ground might receive the layer of mud ; he then sowed his ground, and in three or four months the hot sun of the climate had ripened a plentiful harvest. All this assumes that the inundation rose to
the

the requisite height. If it failed to do so, or fell far short, a famine was the consequence. We have heard in the debates of our own legislature computations of the number of men, and decimals of men, requisite to till an acre, as also the corresponding number of those whom that acre will sustain. In our cold latitude, with a comparatively stubborn soil, the ratio of labourers to consumers is far higher than in Egypt. It is therefore to be expected that it should have produced far more than was needed for its own supply. The monuments happen to give us a close insight into the agricultural arrangements of this early people. What is indicated is simplicity of implements and amplitude of storehouses. The form of one of these is exhibited in a painting of the tomb of Rotei at Benihassan. It consists of a double range of structures resembling ovens, built of brick, with an opening at the top, and a shutter in the side. A flight of stairs gives access to the top of these receptacles, into which the grain, measured and noted, is poured till they are full. The mode of emptying them was to open the shutter in the side, which discharged all above it, after which it was easy for men to enter and throw out through the opening the contents of the lower part.

It is evident, from a glance at these facts, that an Egyptian famine was as terrible in its consequence as it was beyond the reach of human sagacity to foretell its cause. If the reasons of the inundation were so ill understood, who could have calculated beforehand any such contingency as its failure? Hence the proof that Pharaoh's dreams were sent from God. The lean ears and the lean kine were fitting emblems of seasons in which the fields yielded no increase and the cattle died. It was at the same time highly probable that a rocky country like that of the Canaanites, which was fertile only in provinces of limited extent, should have driven the sons of Jacob from its boundaries to seek corn in what must have been the garden of the world. Assuming that agriculture supplied employment to only a small portion of the population, it becomes a question as to what the remainder applied itself. The vast architectural remains which amply repay the efforts of the traveller, in a great degree answer the question. It does not appear that Egypt kept many of its sons idle in standing armies. The military caste, numbering 410,000 men, were only partially engaged in active service. Herodotus tells us that to each soldier was assigned twelve portions of land, each containing 10,000 cubits. Sir Gardner Wilkinson remarks that these allotments were not only a substitute for regular pay, but tended to encourage habits of industry, and to instil a taste for the occupations of a country life. We know that the Israelites were compelled to engage in all manner of service in the field, but they were also employed

ployed in building the treasure-cities Pithom and Raamses. It was to this purpose that the bricks were applied, the making of which was so severe a feature of their bondage. It is quite evident that the existing monuments, the temples and obelisks, and pyramids, represent the labour of untold multitudes. There is very little proof that mechanical skill was resorted to for economising the application of muscular power. Enormous results are presented to us. The blocks of which the pyramids are composed are of extraordinary magnitude, obelisks were erected of a single block of granite. The colossus of Rameses, at the Memnonium, which weighed about 886 tons, is known to have been brought over land from the quarries at the cataracts of Syene, a distance of more than 120 miles. Sir Gardner remarks—‘ This is certainly a surprising weight, and we cannot readily suggest the means adopted for its transport, or its passage of the river ; but the monolithic temple, said by Herodotus to have been taken from Elephantine to Buto, in the Delta, was still large, and far surpassed in weight the pedestal of Peter the Great’s statue at St. Petersburg, which is calculated at about 1200 tons.’^d A pictorial representation of the removal of a colossal statue has been found in a grotto near El Beroheh, which does not suggest any great amount of mechanical contrivance. The colossus rests upon a wooden sledge to a single point of which four ropes were attached. These are dragged by four parties, numbering in all a hundred and seventy-two men ; and a lubricating liquid is poured from a vase, by a person standing on the pedestal of the statue, in order to facilitate its progress as it slides over the ground, which was probably covered with a bed of planks. On the knee of the figure stands a man who claps his hands to the measured cadence of a song, a necessary expedient if the sinews of a hundred and seventy-two were to combine in a simultaneous impulse. It is a remarkable circumstance that no mechanical power has been discovered among the monuments, except a simple form of the lever and the inclined plane. Even the pyramids seem to have been reared on no other plan than that of elevating stones by levers from course to course. The inference is, that reliance was always placed on the multiplication of labourers. Pliny tells us of 20,000 men being employed on a single obelisk ; and in one instance he speaks of as many as 120,000 being gathered for the purpose of raising one of these ponderous structures.

The style of Egyptian architecture owes its distinctive features to the nature of the materials which were employed. The country, as is well known, did not abound in wood, whilst stone was sup-

^d Wilkinson’s *Manners and Customs*, vol. iii. p. 330.

plied in great abundance. The Nile was a ready highway for the contents of the quarries which were found on its banks. Some of the earlier temples were excavations from the rock, but it does not appear from recent hieroglyphical researches that they were exclusively the first essays in architecture. Still they suggest the nature of the art in its primal stage, and in the grottoes of Benihassan and Kalabsché, in Nubia, we may read the original conceptions of the old world architects. We say that abundance of stone gave to Egyptian building its distinctive feature. There was no need to economise materials, consequently in aiming at strength (a requisite in every building), the designer secured his object by exaggerated solidity. Modern science has accomplished wonders in investigating the conditions of attaining the maximum of strength with the minimum of materials. The principle of the arch has been thoroughly explored. It is well known how the catenary curve, or the elongated semi-ellipse, or the semicircle, may be made to satisfy the laws of equilibrium. The flying buttress combines strength with elegance, and the strongest bridges are constructed on oblique sections of the circular or the elliptical cylinder. We have discovered also that a columnar tube, rightly adjusted in its proportions, bears four times the weight as the same quantity of material in a solid form. We have also learned something of what is technically termed 'thrust,' and know how the resultant pressure of a series of weights may be met by a support properly directed. A geometrical staircase is an example of this, where each step presses obliquely upon the one below, till the whole weight is transmitted to the solid foundation on which the structure rests. All these contrivances were virtually pronounced impossibilities by the architects of the days of Rameses or Sesortasen. The arch is wanting.* We find no trussed roofs, no flying buttresses. A heavy entablature has to be supported. A rank of columns of elephantine proportions forms itself in close array to support the weight. There is clumsiness rather than boldness in this. The same columns would bear the weight of Cheops' pyramid. Sometimes colossal figures take the place of these columns, and it must be admitted that their gigantic forms, disposed in an attitude of undisturbed repose, give to the building

* A building has been discovered at Thebes, in which is found a chamber with a vaulted roof, where the stones are not fitted one upon another, after the manner of an arch, but placed horizontally, one projecting beyond that immediately below it, till the uppermost two meet in the centre, the interior angles being afterwards rounded off, to form the appearance of a vault. This would imply that the principle of the arch was unknown; but other instances can be produced, from which it would appear that even pointed arches were constructed at a period antecedent to the Exodus. Sir Gardner Wilkinson thinks that the Egyptians considered their introduction ill-suited to the style of architecture which they generally adopted.

an air of grandeur bordering on the sublime. The massiveness of the style was, however, much relieved by the profusion of sculptured ornament. The columns themselves, besides being covered with hieroglyphics, were often striated, and the appearance of being composed of united stems was increased by the horizontal bands which tied them together under the capital and in the middle.

In comparing Egyptian architecture with the Greek, on which it impressed something of a parent's likeness, Mr. Kenrick aptly remarks that

'we see in them the difference between the art which has developed itself from instinctive feeling, and that which has received its laws from the reflecting intellect. In the Greek temples,' he adds, 'the æsthetic, in the Egyptian the religious feeling predominated; all the subordinate and accessory parts being calculated to bring the worshipper into the immediate presence of the god with an increasing impression of awe. The approach was frequently by a dromos, or double row of sphinxes, mysterious compounds of the human form, with a lion or a ram, denoting the union of strength and intellect in gods and kings.'—*Kenrick*, vol. i. p. 260.

We cannot pass from this subject without referring to those marvels of all ages, the pyramids. Built in a form that defies the ravages of time, devoid of ornament as they are of utility, they remain an object of the curiosity and speculation to every traveller. If no earthquake disturb their colossal structure it is probable that in the last conflagration of the earth they will form part of the works therein which are to be burned up. The hieroglyphics have revealed the names of the kings who built them: it is satisfactorily established that each pyramid served as a single tomb, but with regard to their date, with regard to the motives which prompted efforts so gigantic for an end so inconsiderable, we are left to conjecture. At best they serve as lasting monuments of despotic folly. They are Babel-towers, which record how the thousands of an oppressed people were forced to expend life and sinew to gratify the whim of a tyrant.

The following description will be acceptable to the reader:—

'The pyramids of Gizeh are about five miles distant from the bank of the Nile. As the traveller approaches them first across the plain, and then the sandy valley to which the inundation does not extend, he is usually disappointed by their appearance, which falls short of the conception that their fame had raised. Their height and breadth are lessened by the hills of sand and heaps of rubbish which have accumulated around them. The simplicity and geometrical regularity of their outline is unfavourable to their apparent magnitude; there is nothing near them by which they can be measured; and it is not till standing

at their base, he looks up to their summit and compares their proportions with his own, or those of the human figures around them that this first error of the judgment is corrected. And when he begins to inquire into their history, and finds that 2300 years ago their first describer was even more ignorant than ourselves of the time and purpose of their erection, he feels how remote must be their origin, which even then was an insoluble problem. They stand upon a rocky platform of unequal height, but where highest, elevated about 100 feet above the plain, and forming a kind of promontory in the Libyan chain, whose greatest projection is towards the north-east.¹ Such a range of low rock, the first step in the ascent of the Libyan hills, borders the valley of the Nile to the entrance of the Fyoom, and on it all the pyramids which occur in this district are placed.²—*Kenrick*, vol. i. p. 117..

If we turn from those arts of the Egyptians, the results of which are of such colossal magnitude, we find that they were not the only ones in which they attained to success. Egyptian remains have been transferred to the glass-cases of our museums, and admit of microscopic examination, affording an interesting contrast to those huge erections which rear their heads on the banks of the Nile. There is every evidence that the art of polishing and engraving precious stones was known from the earliest times. The reader may find a vast profusion of signet rings, amulets, and scarabæi in the British Museum. One of the latter bears the name of Menes, the earliest in Manetho's lists. Many of them are engraved with great minuteness, and present remarkable variety. They exhibit figures of deities, sacred animals, the names of kings, short inscriptions, and other symbols. They have formed portions of necklaces, bracelets, rings, or other articles of personal adornment. Dress seems to have been much studied in Egypt, and was diversified according to the several gradations of rank. When Joseph was made next in authority to Pharaoh, he was arrayed in vestures of fine linen, and a gold chain was placed about his neck. Wilkinson³ makes an apposite remark, which illustrates this feature in Joseph's history. The investiture of a chief, he says, was a ceremony of considerable importance when the post conferred was connected with any high dignity about the person of the monarch, in the army, or the priesthood. It took place in the presence of the sovereign seated

¹ As we have not set ourselves the task of criticising Mr. Kenrick's interesting and valuable work so much as of giving to our readers some of the more prominent results of Egyptian research, we cannot stay to analyse style and grammar. We would, however, recommend to Mr. K. that, before he prints his second edition, he should revise his English composition, making the above and numerous other passages less elliptical, and more flowing. Let Cicero be the model rather than Tacitus.

² *Manners and Customs*, vol. v. p. 293.

on his throne ; and two priests, having arrayed the candidate in a long, loose vesture, placed necklaces round the neck of the person thus honoured by the royal favour. The British Museum contains abundant specimens of the goldsmith's handicraft, which show at the same time that the early Egyptians were well able to turn to account the ornamental stones which the quarries of the country hid in their recesses. Thus we have necklaces, bracelets, pendent ornaments, and beads. One necklace has pendants in the form of the lock of Horus, fish, and cowries, with a cowrie-shaped clasp ; another has flat beads, representing deities and symbols ; a third, blue spherical beads capped with silver. The materials employed include gold and silver, bronze and electrum, carnelian, jasper, porcelain, and arragonite. The mummy cases yield specimens of Egyptian weaving. Some of their 'fine linen,' indeed, has been found to exceed the most delicate fabrics of modern times. The finest French cambric is said to have 120 threads to the inch, whilst the warp of the Egyptian fabric has at least four times that number. Wilkinson^a remarks, that the dresses of many of the figures depicted on the monuments represent a texture so fine and transparent that it is sometimes scarcely to be discovered in its outline, even when the paintings are well preserved. One remarkable feature of the Egyptian lady's toilet deserves to be noticed, as our national collection affords indications of it, and the custom is alluded to in Scripture. Jezebel (2 Kings ix. 30) is said to have painted her face, and tired her head, and looked out at a window. In the margin, 'put her eyes in painting.' And we find this expression (Ezek. xxiii. 40), 'For whom thou didst wash thyself, paintedst thine eyes, and deckedst thyself with ornaments.' The custom of staining the eyelids and brows, says Sir G. Wilkinson,¹ with a moistened powder of a black colour, was common in Egypt from the earliest times. It was also introduced among the Jews and Romans, and is retained in the East in the present day. It is thought to increase the beauty of the eye, which is made to appear larger by this external addition of a black ring ; and many even suppose the stimulus its application gives to be beneficial to the sight. It is made in various ways ; some use antimony, black oxide of manganese, preparations of lead, and other mineral substances ; others the powder, or the lampblack of burnt almonds, or frankincense ; and many prefer a mixture of different ingredients. The Museum contains several cases for holding this black pigment, termed sthem or stibium. They are of wood, ivory, and porcelain. One of them carved in ivory represents a

^a *Manners and Customs*, vol. ii. p. 333.

¹ *Ibid.*, vol. iii. p. 380.

monkey standing erect, grasping with both arms a cylinder, with its cover of wood. In the same cases we find examples of the mirror used by Egyptian females. Considerable taste and ingenuity are displayed in the handles. One of them is of ivory, in the form of a column; another of porcelain, in that of a lotus-sceptre, inscribed with the name of Mentuemha, son of Hekheth. The mirror was made of mixed metal, chiefly copper, most carefully wrought and highly polished; and so admirably did the skill of the Egyptians succeed in the composition of metals, that this substitute for our modern looking-glass was susceptible of a lustre which has been even partially revived at the present day in some of those discovered at Thebes, though buried in the earth for many centuries. The same kind of metal mirror was used by the Israelites, who, doubtless, brought them from Egypt; and the brazen laver made by Moses for the tabernacle was composed 'of the looking-glasses of the women which assembled at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation' (Exod. xxxviii. 8).

There is ample evidence that music was studied by the Egyptians. Dr. Burney tells us that instruments of percussion were undoubtedly the earliest attempts. The lyre, the cymbal, and the drum, are the general type of what we find in use in the infancy of nations. In fact, the earliest musical instruments produced a single note. It was an advance upon this to have a series of pipes or strings, each producing its own sound. The next step was to make the same string or pipe produce a portion, or the whole of the gamut. Musical notation and the laws of harmony will then follow, until the art attain that degree of perfection of which it admits. Modern analysis has counted the motions of the vibrating cord, and modern genius has produced the anthem, the fugue, and the oratorio; but it may well be doubted whether the early Egyptians had not made considerable progress. If they had a musical notation we are unable to decypher it, the echoes of their harmonies have died away; but specimens remain which show that the finger-board was not unknown to them. Modern musicians know full well that instruments constructed on the principle of the violin are the only perfect ones. The guitar and the plectrum have been found in Egyptian tombs. The British Museum contains the top of a harp which has had seventeen strings, besides smaller ones of five strings. A pair of bronze cymbals, five inches in diameter, remind us of the allusion in Ps. cl. 5, of the high-sounding cymbals. In some of the paintings which have been brought to light, a square tambourine is represented as played in concert with other instruments. In one picture found at Thebes, women beat the tam-
bourine

bourine and darabooka drum without the addition of any other instrument, *dancing* or *singing* to the sound. This very strongly suggests the rejoicings of Miriam, who 'took a *timbrel* in her hand; and all the women went out after her with timbrels and with dances' (Exod. xv. 20).

The painting and sculpture of the Egyptians do not in themselves afford much clue to the date of their origin. Mr. Layard remarks that, with regard to Assyrian art, its older specimens are superior to those of a later date, implying that the taste of those engaged in it suffered a deteriorating process. The same remark would apply in many respects to the efforts of their rivals on the banks of the Nile. There would appear to be two antagonistic principles which have swayed the destinies of painting and sculpture in all ages; the one is conventionality, the other adherence to nature. They may be seen waging war at this very day on the walls of our Royal Academy. Nature is of course the first preceptor, and those who have conscientiously recorded Nature's aspects have been rewarded with some measure of success. At the same time it is to be admitted that the experience of others has its value. No one man can, by his unassisted observations, attain to the intimate knowledge of Nature, her forms, and colours, and varying expressions, which his predecessors have in the aggregate acquired. Hence the necessity for *rules* in art. A rule, whether we style it canon or dogma, is, generally speaking, the recorded experience of nature. But rules may become as it were fossilized; the dead semblance of a living thing, and then they are mere conventionalisms. The imaginary landscape which is painted, perhaps, by lamplight, the Hercules sculptured according to a predetermined arrangement of bones and muscles, are most likely to embody a great deal that assimilates to conventionality rather than to nature. Egyptian art is conventional *ad nauseam*. Let us hear Sir Gardner on this subject:—

'Deficient in conception, and, above all, in a proper knowledge of grouping, they were unable to form those combinations which give true expression; every picture was made up of isolated parts, put together according to some general notions, but without harmony or preconceived effect. The human face, the whole body, and everything they introduced, were composed in the same manner, of separate members placed together one by one, according to their relative situations; the eye, the nose, and other features composed a face; but the expression of feelings and passions was entirely wanting; and the countenance of the king, whether charging an enemy's phalanx in the heat of battle or peaceably offering incense in a sombre temple, presented the same outline and the same inanimate look. The peculiarity of the front view of an eye introduced in a profile, is thus accounted for; it was the ordinary representation of that feature added to a profile,

profile, and no allowance was made for any change in the position of the head.'—*Manners and Customs*, vol. iii. p. 265.

It is evident, notwithstanding, that this did not arise so much because genius was deficient as because it was fettered. Any observer of the casts exhibited in the British Museum, representing the triumphs of Rameses, will notice that the wild animals introduced are outlined far better than the men and horses. The former supplied a new study; with regard to the latter, the artist must abide by prescribed rules. It must be admitted also, that a great knowledge of colour was displayed, especially for the purpose of decoration. *Chiaro scuro* was a thing unknown, but contrasts of crude colour are sometimes managed with considerable effect. We may observe here in passing, that it is one of the marvels of this extraordinary country that we should be able to discuss the colouring powers of its artists. None but an Egyptian atmosphere would have transmitted those works to so late a period.

In pursuing our investigations into the antiquities of Egypt we are met at every step by some memorial of its religion, or rather its idolatries. Mr. Kenrick's chapters on 'Egyptian Theology' are among the most elaborate of his carefully compiled work. Indeed we cannot do better than refer any reader to his volumes who wishes to make himself entirely master of this branch of the inquiry. He will be able to put himself in possession of the names and genealogies of their gods, their legendary history, their connection with the Assyrian, Grecian, and Roman Pantheon, the mode of their worship, and the particular names in which they were respectively held in special adoration. The paintings and sculptures which have survived the wreck of ages, abound in representations of the various deities. They have generally the body of a man with a varying head, sometimes that of a bird, sometimes of a crocodile, frequently of an animal, as the lion, the goat, the dog or the cat, not seldom that of a reptile, a serpent, or a frog. These representations amply confirm the Scriptural testimony to the degrading idolatry of the people. The Mosaic ordinances implied throughout that the people of Israel were in danger of recurring to the abominations of the land of their captivity. And at a subsequent period Jeremiah gives utterance to this prophecy—'I will kindle a fire in the houses of the gods of Egypt; and he shall burn them, and carry them away captives; and he shall array himself with the land of Egypt as a shepherd putteth on his garment; and he shall go forth from thence in peace. He shall break also the images of Beth-shemesh (in the margin the house of the Sun), that is in the land of Egypt; and the houses of the gods of the Egyptians shall be burn with fire' (Jer.

(Jer. xliii. 12, 13). The prophecy of Ezekiel is similar—'I will cause their idols to cease out of Noph (Memphis), and there shall be no more a prince of the land of Egypt' (Ezek. xxx. 13). These superstitions are described more in detail by Isaiah. 'The spirit of Egypt shall fail in the midst thereof; and I will destroy the counsel thereof; and they shall seek to the idols, and to the charmers, and to them that have familiar spirits, and to the wizards' (Isa. xix. 3). We need scarcely refer to the remarkable fulfilment of these prophecies. The very site of Memphis is at this day scarcely discernible; the idols have ceased from the land; its kings exist only in ruined memorials; and for centuries it has groaned under the yoke of a foreign power. It would appear that the complaint charged against Egypt, throughout the prophetic denunciations, is that of its idolatry. Blood and rapine, and cruelty, are laid at the door of other nations, but the sin of this country is always idolatry. Solomon marries a wife from among them, and his heart is turned aside; the Jewish nation adopts its customs, its luxuries and effeminacy. It is the alluring tempter rather than the terrible tyrant, the broken reed, on which if a man lean it will run through his hand.

The origin of the Egyptian worship seems to have been partly a reverence for heroes (*διδασκαλίη δαιμονίων*, 1 Tim. iv. 1), partly an adoration of the powers of nature. The former generally characterizes a military nation, the latter an agricultural, and as the Egyptians combined the two we may expect to find both principles at the root of their religion. We say that a military nation would be likely to deify heroes. The recollection of conquests and glorious achievements, whilst it nourished the pride of those engaged, would show itself in gratitude to the bold spirit who led the way to victory. If he perished by the last dart of a retiring foe so much the more was he sure of an apotheosis. An agricultural people, on the other hand, would be inclined to worship the powers of nature. We have already alluded to the uncertainty of the inundations by which the Nile yearly lent to the land its fertility. It was a mysterious chance to the husbandman whether he should in any given year rejoice in a full harvest, or perish in a famine. The river is to be his friend or his foe. What then? It is at once elevated into a god possessed of volition. It has attributes of power. Its favour must be sought, its enmity deprecated. Its image is carved. Temples are reared, a priesthood is appointed, and what may have begun in symbolism, or in the expression of man's dependence on the bounties of Providence, works its way into the most detestable idolatries. The ignorance of the people and the craft of the priest perpetuate the evil. The devil finds in the latter a ready instrument
for

for securing the former in hopeless bondage. It is quite consistent with this that an acknowledgment of the divine unity should not altogether disappear, though it has but little prominence in the minds and feelings of the idolatrous votaries. The ignorant soldier may cherish the memory of departed heroes; they led his fathers to victory, but they did not confer on himself the breath of life. The husbandman may perceive that the river fertilises his fields, but it did not call the fields into existence. Those questions remain which can only be solved by the acknowledgment of a great First Cause. The sequence of causes is associated in the mind with the law of generation. Hence to the gods is assigned a genealogy, and to the highest name in the family-tree is assigned the attribute of creator. He is the *Zeus πατὴρ*, the Jupiter, the father of gods and men. The first name in the Egyptian list is Amun, the second Khem. Both of these are evidently forms of the name Ham בן, the son of Noah. The latter is also identical with Chemi, the Coptic name of the territory which has become familiarised to European ears as the root from which the word 'chemistry' ^k is derived. Now the deity Amun will illustrate our remark on the worship of heroes. Khem represents the productive power of nature and answers to the Pan of the Grecian mythology. The next six of the principal deities are Kneph, Ptah, Maut, Athor, Neith, and Pasht. We often find the names of these chief deities combined with others representing some particular attribute. Thus Amunra is Amun worshipped as the sun. Another combination is Amun-Hor with the head of a hawk, the bird especially consecrated to Horus. This hawk-headed god is worthy of notice, as supplying a link with the mythology of Assyria, corresponding as it does to the deity supposed to be Nisroch, which is so conspicuous in the Layard-collection.

Great pains were taken by the Greek writers to connect the Egyptian pantheon with their own, as well as to explain it according to the principles of their pantheistic philosophy. It would be idle for us to attempt to follow out their speculations. It matters little whether Amunra is identical with Phœbus, or Osiris with Dionusos. If these deities were the spontaneous creations of inwrought superstition, it is evident that they would spring up like weeds in a neglected garden, whether transplanted or not from another locality. To suppose the various powers of nature to have been symbolized by their deities, would imply abstract conceptions too transcendental for the most part for such a matter-of-fact

^k *Ancient Egypt*, vol. i. p. 215.

people. The results of their theology were the maddest superstitions. It is humiliating to human nature to witness their dog-worship and cat-worship, their sacred cows and holy crocodiles. Human life with them was of minor importance, but the lower animals were treated with superstitious reverence, and their remains, as our own Museum will show, were embalmed as carefully as the body of a monarch. In fact the last blow, which was fatal to the Egyptian monarchy, was the immediate result of this gross superstition.

Rollin quotes from Polyænus the account of the stratagem practised by Cambyses in the battle which made him master of the country,—

‘Being informed that the whole garrison (of Pelusium) consisted of Egyptians, he placed in the front of his army a great number of cats, dogs, sheep, and other animals, which were looked upon as sacred by that nation, and then attacked the city by storm. The soldiers of the garrison not daring either to fling a dart, or shoot an arrow that way, for fear of hitting some of those animals, Cambyses became master of the place without opposition.’—*Rollin*, vol. ii. p. 248.

To record Egyptian mythology is not merely to narrate a series of popular superstitions. The importance attached to the several features of the national creed was wonderfully enhanced by the fixedness imparted to them by a well organized *priesthood*. This was in fact a gigantic political institution, which gave its own impress to all other institutions whilst they retained any existence. It is fatal to society when any class of men acquire the monopoly of all mental acquirements. And when such monopolists sway the religious belief of those around them the tyranny they are able to exercise is almost unlimited. They can, under such circumstances, apply every discovery of science, nay, the simplest results of acquired knowledge to work upon the fears of the ignorant. They can invest themselves with the odour of sanctity, nay, almost with the attributes of deity. The mythical histories of the gods and demigods were simply early legends of the country improved by the priests. The body of Osiris, the son of Ra, was divided into fourteen parts, and gathered by Isis. In other words, the land of Egypt was originally portioned out into fourteen provinces. Medical science was sent from heaven, and Æsculapius was its god. Music had a like origin. These, and many other credenda, were just the accounts which the priesthood chose to give of sciences and arts which were probably their own invention, and which they retained in their own power. Truth, however, is not advanced when scientific investigation is wholly surrendered to the lay portion of the community. Let the students of inspiration be well informed in the laws and phenomena of the physical world,
let

let the savans be guided by the infallible dicta of Holy Writ, and we shall hear of fewer discrepancies between what is revealed and what is discovered.

'Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians,' in other words, he must have been initiated in the mysteries of the priesthood. Like Pythagoras, at a later date, he must have conformed to the laws of the order, and by a slow course of instruction, arrived at the knowledge of their arcana. There is reason to believe that this 'wisdom' extended to the rudiments of most of the sciences, including astronomy, geometry, and chemistry. The Greeks gave them the credit of their origination, and there does not appear any sufficient reason for denying such an hypothesis. It is equally probable that architecture was a sacred mystery, just as the monks in mediæval times charged themselves with the erection of our churches and cathedrals, and by their elaborate symbolism made every feature in the building of mysterious significance. Medicine was peculiarly a sacerdotal profession among the Egyptians, as also the surgery requisite for the embalming of the dead.

Astronomy is very closely intermingled with their mythology. The motions of the heavenly bodies had been observed with much accuracy, and their phenomena recorded in the dark language of myth. On this point we quote Sir Gardner Wilkinson:—

'Isis and other deities assumed on different occasions various characters; and Sothis, the dog-star, was one of those assigned to the sister of Osiris. This adaptation of Isis, and other deities, to the planetary system, led to the remark of Eusebius, "that the Egyptians esteem the sun to be the Demiurgus; and hold the legends about Osiris and Isis, and all their other mythological fables, to have reference to the stars, their appearances and occultations, and the periods of their risings, or to the increase and decrease of the moon, to the cycles of the sun, to the diurnal and nocturnal hemispheres, or to the river." Plutarch also gives one explanation of the history of Isis and Osiris, taken from the phenomena of eclipses.'—*Manners and Customs*, vol. iv. p. 371.

The measurement of the angular bearings of certain passages in the great pyramid suggests a relation between that ancient structure and the position of the stars. It must be borne in mind that each of the great pyramids is built accurately with its faces towards the points of the compass. From the north face a passage descends in the plane of the meridian inclined at an angle of $26^{\circ} 41'$ to the horizon. This corresponds, within a few minutes, to the latitude of the place. In other words, this passage commands the pole, and coincides in direction with the axis of the earth. This can scarcely have been accidental.

With

With regard to geometry, Mr. Kenrick does not think that it ever advanced much beyond land-surveying (a very necessary department of knowledge in a country so much dependent on agriculture), but such as it was he supposes the priests to have enjoyed the monopoly of it. He remarks :—

‘Nothing remains in the monuments by which we could ascertain the state of the science in early times; but the belief of the Greeks, that Pythagoras, Thales, Pherecydes, Anaxagoras, and Plato, had derived their knowledge of mathematics from Egypt, would be inexplicable if this country had not long preceded their own in its cultivation.’—*Anc. Egypt*, vol. i. p. 327.

We have much indirect evidence of their knowledge of chemistry in the different objects of art which have survived. The bright colours that have stood the test of thousands of years, might well excite envy in the breast of a modern artist. The bronzes, and gold and silver ornaments, suggest that the art of metallurgy had risen to high perfection. The skill displayed by the Israelites in the casting of the golden calf was less wonderful than the art possessed by Moses of administering it subsequently as a potion to those who had been guilty of worshipping it. ‘Commentators,’^m says M. Goguet, ‘have been much perplexed to explain how Moses burnt and reduced the gold to powder. Many have offered vain and improbable conjectures, but an experienced chemist has removed every difficulty upon the subject, and has suggested the simple process. In the place of tartaric acid, which we employ, the Hebrew legislator used natron, which is common in the East. What follows respecting his making the Israelites drink this powder, proves that he was perfectly acquainted with the whole effect of the operation. He wished to increase the punishment of their disobedience, and nothing could have been more suitable; for gold, reduced and made into a draught in the manner I have mentioned, has a most disagreeable taste.’

The practice of medicine was distributed among the members of the faculty, in the infancy of the science, in a way not dissimilar to the etiquette observed by our own most eminent men. Each took his own special branch. There were no *general* practitioners, but some were oculists, some dentists, some treated diseases of the head, some of the bowels, and some those of uncertain seat. They distinguished between physiology, pathology, pharmaceutics, and surgery. Unfortunately, they were fettered too much to make much progress in their respective branches. Each disease, with its remedies, stood on record in the ancient books. From the precepts therein contained, the physician was not allowed to

^m Goguet, *Origine des Loix, des Arts, et des Sciences*, tome ii. livre 2, chap. iv. p. 145.

depart, his own life was forfeited if he ventured to do so. Herodotus makes it appear that the people must almost have left their medical advisers to starve. Assuming that 'the stomach was the centre of sympathies,' they devoted three days in the month to the correction of its irregularities, for they suppose, remarks this accurate observer, 'that all diseases to which men are subject proceed from the food they use. And indeed, in other respects the Egyptians, next to the Libyans, are the most healthy people in the world.'^a

Mr. Kenrick devotes his second volume almost entirely to a careful analysis of the dynastic lists of Manetho. This portion of the work is exceedingly valuable, and betokens very great accuracy of research on the part of the learned author. The events noticed are, however, scattered and disconnected. If we could determine the chronology of events recorded in scripture, the investigation would be more satisfactory. The very names of the kings with whose history Abraham, and Joseph, and Moses, were successively connected, can only be conjectured. Twenty-one of these dynasties pass before we reach a point of anything like certainty. Mr. K. says:—

'The earliest event in Egyptian history which can be connected with a known date in that of any other country, is the invasion of Judea by Shishak, or Sheshonk, in the reign of Rehoboam. As the chronology of the Jewish Scriptures is in this age definite and authentic, we are able to fix the reign of Sheshonk in years before the Christian era.' But this does not enable us to carry backward an exact chronology through all the reigns of his predecessors, owing to the uncertainty and interruption of the successions, both in the MSS. and in the monuments; and in the previous part of the Jewish history, the sovereigns of Egypt are only mentioned by the common name of Pharaoh, which would not suffice for their identification, even if the Jewish chronology itself were in early ages certain.'—*Ancient Egypt*, vol. ii. p. 109.

It would occupy more space than can be here devoted to the inquiry, if we were to pursue the complexities of the chronology of these dynasties. Egyptian history is at best fragmentary, and any attempt to render the accounts consistent and continuous

^a Herodotus, ii. 77.

^o Dr. Hawks's *Monuments of Egypt*, p. 246, gives an interesting engraving of a tablet copied from the sculptures found on the walls of the temple of Karnak. It represents a figure of a captive, apparently of Jewish features, to whom is attached an oval bearing a hieroglyphical inscription, which has been decyphered *Judah melek Kah*. There is ample evidence that the king who caused this tablet to be erected is the same whose tablet is translated, 'Beloved of Amun Sheshonk.' There can be little doubt that the series of tablets commemorated the conquest of Judea by Shishak, as recorded in the book of Chronicles.

would

would be not unlike an endeavour to restore the city of Thebes, or the temple of Karnak, to the exact state in which they delighted the eyes of the Pharaohs. But this does not disqualify Egypt from bearing witness to the truth of the Bible. Our American friend, Dr. Hawks, has laboriously investigated its monuments, and documents, and finds much that establishes the vital truth that the Pentateuch is an accurate history, that its pretensions are corroborated by independent facts, and consequently, that the inspiration to which it lays claim must be conceded to it. He does not bring to the inquiry that species of German criticism that assumes all things false until they are proved true, but, whilst he examines every objection with a candid impartiality, he clings to the Bible as a book he knows to be from God, and rejoices in every new fragment of evidence which is vocal with the exclamation, 'Let God be true and every man a liar.' We hope that his book will be widely circulated, and attentively perused on both sides of the Atlantic. It is pleasant to hear from the new world a voice relating to this primal country of the old, that the inhabitant of a land which is necessarily poor in ruins, should direct our attention to one that reveals antiquity at every step. The Bible, indeed, is neither Jewish nor Egyptian, neither a mere remnant of antiquity nor a literary novelty, but an inspired record, addressed to the souls of men in all ages and in all lands.

Dr. H. addresses himself to the specific question which relates to the government of Egypt at the time of the Exodus. He refers to the circumstance that in the history of Joseph we meet with the declaration that 'every shepherd was an abomination to the Egyptians,' whilst in the days of Abraham a pastoral calling does not appear to have been held in disrepute. He refers also to the fact that the family of Jacob were compelled in consequence to settle in the land of Goshen. Now the sixteenth and seventeenth dynasties of Manetho contain the names of an intruding race of Hyksos, or shepherd-kings, who appear to have conquered the country, and settled in Lower Egypt. They were probably a nomade tribe, or assemblage of tribes, who treated the people with oppression, and made the very name of shepherd an 'abomination' to them. Dr. H. legitimately infers that this invasion took place at some period intervening between the visits of Abraham and Joseph. It is not impossible that the Pharaoh who elevated Joseph to be his vizier, belonged to the eighteenth dynasty, and that in the land of Goshen, which he appropriated to the children of Israel, some of the Hyksos race may have been permitted to remain after their expulsion from the land of Egypt. If these shepherds were of Phenician origin, a theory may be framed as to the use made by the Israelites of a phonetic alphabet, differing

differing so completely from the hieroglyphics of the Egyptians, and this would be corroborated by the universal tradition that writing was a Phenician invention. Dr. Hawks makes it very clear that the eastern border land of Egypt was assigned to the Israelites; that Goshen was in fact situated near the Delta, and on the bank of the Nile nearest to Palestine. He argues also, that the royal city at that time was probably Tanis, or the Zoan of Scripture.

'The whole Pentateuch,' he says, 'shows in a general manner that the abode of royalty then was somewhere in Lower Egypt. Tanis, or Zoan, was one of the oldest cities in Egypt, for it was there in Abraham's day, and was then of some note, and considered as a sort of standard with which to compare other cities; "And Hebron was built seven years before Zoan in Egypt." When Moses performed his miracles before the Pharaoh who refused to let the Israelites go, where was the residence of that Pharaoh? At his chief city. Where were the miracles wrought? Let the Bible answer, "Marvellous things did he in the sight of their fathers, in the land of Egypt, in the field of Zoan.'" Ps. lxxviii. 12.

Now Mr. Kendrick regards the attempts made to discover who was the Pharaoh of the Exodus as all but hopeless. It does not, however, seem impossible to determine the dynasty in which the various events took place. Although a single name is given in Scripture for the monarch who persecuted the children of Israel, we are not hindered from supposing their bondage to have extended over several reigns. According to Horapollo *Ouro* is the Coptic for 'king,' whence the royal serpent, *Βασιλίσκος*, is called *Uræus*. If we supply the affix *Ph* we have the title *Ph'ouro*, or Pharaoh, which was common to a long series of the Egyptian monarchs. Dr. Hawks gives an engraved copy (p. 180) of a painting found at Thebes in the tomb of one Roschere, who was superintendent of the great buildings in the reign of Thothmes III. of the eighteenth dynasty. Men are employed, some in working up the clay with an instrument resembling the Egyptian hoe, others in carrying loads of it on their shoulders, moulding it into bricks and transporting them, by means of a yoke laid across the shoulders, to the place where they are to be laid out for drying in the sun. The physiognomy and colour of most of those who are thus engaged show them to be foreigners, and their aquiline nose and yellow complexion suggest the idea that they are Jews. Their labour is evidently compulsory; Egyptian taskmasters stand by with sticks in their hands; and though one or two native Egyptians appear among them, we may easily suppose that they have been condemned to hard labour for their crimes.^p Wilkinson

^p See *Ancient Egypt*, vol. ii. p. 230.

remarks that more bricks of the reign of Thothmes have been discovered than of any other. It is true that Roschere's monument was discovered at Thebes, at a considerable distance from Goshen, where the Israelites dwelt; but, as we are expressly told that they were 'scattered abroad throughout all the land of Egypt to find stubble instead of straw,' it is quite consistent with the facts that one of their superintendents should have resided in a separate locality.

If we make due allowance for all difficulties of detail we may thus arrange the narrative of the bondage and Exodus. Let us suppose the Hyksos dynasty to have come to an end, and the last remains of their tribes driven into the land of Goshen, as our own forefathers were compelled to seek refuge in Wales and Cornwall. In the reign of one of the latter kings of this native dynasty, Joseph comes to Egypt. He found favour with a monarch who was essentially Egyptian in his mode of government and domestic habits. The native gods are in high honour; Joseph himself receives an Egyptian name, he marries the daughter of the chief priest of Re at Heliopolis; the lands of the priests alone escape forfeiture to the crown in the famine. He is invested with the insignia of office with the same ceremonies which were practised at the court of Setei Menephthah. The king has a splendid retinue; a chief captain of the guard, a chief butler and chief baker, magicians and wise men. Whilst enjoying the post of vizier, Joseph receives a visit from his brethren, who are unconscious before whom they bowed the knee. When they eat, it is at a separate table from the natives of the country. The language is moreover unintelligible. At length the whole family is settled in the land. A special grant is made to them; and, although the conditions of tenure are not specified in Scripture, it is likely enough that they were required to graze cattle and labour in the field, or at least to share the produce of their territory with the nation who protected them. Under the dynasty to which the Pharaoh belonged who made the grant, it is probable they were happily situated, and found abundant sustenance for their rapidly increasing numbers. But the Memphitic dynasty was displaced, another dynasty succeeded, 'a new king arose, which knew not Joseph.' It was easy for this new Pharaoh to rescind the engagements of his predecessors while he imposed additional burdens on those who had paid tribute. It was pretended that the Hebrews who had increased in numbers were becoming dangerous to the state: particularly as they lived on the side next to the nomade tribes, with whom they might make alliances, and more especially as the descendants of the Hyksos were some of them remaining in Goshen,

Goshen, and others had withdrawn only to Palestine. Hence the necessity, real or supposed, for erecting military magazines or garrisons (treasure-cities, πόλεις ὀχυράς, Exod. i. 11, LXX. version) on the Asiatic frontier. By employing them to build Raamses at the eastern end of the valley of Goshen, and Pithom at the western, a barrier was provided against future invasions, and the children of Israel were kept in subjection.

How long this severe bondage lasted we know not. Omitting seven reigns from the list recorded on the tablet of Abydos, we come to Rameses III., in whose reign the tablet itself was erected. He was the Sesostris of Herodotus, and signalised himself beyond all other monarchs of his race, no less by the wide extent of his conquests than by the splendour of his buildings. At Mitrahenny a colossal statue still exists, forty eight feet in height, bearing his titular shield. It is also supposed that the great Sphinx at Gizeh bears his features, and was erected as a memorial of his victories. It would be straining evidence to assert positively that Rameses the Great was the Pharaoh of the Exodus. But it would appear that his reign approximated to that event in point of time, and if so we establish a most valuable consideration in connection with the deliverance of an unarmed race of captives, that they escaped the hands of their oppressors carrying their gold and silver and jewels away with them at the very time that the resources of the Egyptian monarchy in wealth, power, and military prowess had reached their most splendid elevation. The enemy said, 'I will pursue, I will overtake, I will divide the spoil; my lust shall be satisfied upon them; I will draw my sword, my hand shall destroy them. Thou didst blow with thy wind, the sea covered them; they sank as lead in the mighty waters. Who is like unto thee, O Lord, among the gods? Who is like thee, glorious in holiness, fearful in praises, doing wonders? Thou stretchedst out thy right hand, the earth swallowed them. Thou in thy mercy hast led forth the people which thou hast redeemed; thou hast guided them in thy strength unto thy holy habitation' (Exod. xv. 9—13).

In tracing the career of the descendants of the patriarch in connection with Egyptian history, as well as manners and customs, it might seem that the connection would cease when the Red Sea is crossed, and that the Scripture narrative can derive no new elucidation in matters subsequent to that event. Dr. Hawks has, however, very ingeniously established an important link, and one which brings to view many 'undesigned coincidences' between the minute features of the Mosaic account and what might have been expected when the circumstances are fully considered. It may
be

be embodied in the proposition which we subjoin. The long residence of the family of Israel in Egypt having assimilated their manners and customs to those of the country in which they had dwelt, that resemblance must have continued more or less during their wanderings. This will readily be admitted to a partial extent, but few will realize at first how completely this influence must have exerted itself. If we look at the third generation of any foreign refugees in a modern country, we shall find but little of the fatherland remaining in their recollection. They may possibly speak its language, or the language of their adopted country may be tinged with a foreign accent. The sixth or seventh generation will retain only the foreign surname. Every other trace will have vanished. It may be alleged, perhaps, that the very descendants of the Egyptian captives are examples of the reverse of this. But the Jews of the present day have historical traditions as well as a religious ritual far more distinct than the Israelites at the time we speak of. The captives, as they plied their tasks, had but a dim recollection of the promises made to their fathers, and even after their deliverance had taken place, constantly preferred the recollection of Egyptian comforts to the anticipation of the glories of the land of promise. Moses well knew that the very name of Jehovah would be strange to them. He was instructed, therefore, to say that I AM (the self-existent One) had sent him unto them. What indeed could there be amongst them that was *not* Egyptian? They had tilled the soil of Egypt, eaten its food, and worn its garments. Moses was learned in its wisdom, and Bezaleel and Aholiab were practised in its arts. What were their conceptions of divine worship? Certainly they had not learned to worship God in spirit and in truth. In no dispensation antecedent to the Incarnation was worship purely spiritual offered. It was always more or less ceremonial, and the Divine presence was manifested by external symbol. The Levitical ordinances abounded in forms; and as they were instituted immediately after the Exodus, we may readily conceive that they would be intelligible to the people only so far as they corresponded to what they had been accustomed to witness. We may bear in mind that the religious ceremonies of all heathen nations retain, though in a corrupt form, many of the features of primitive worship, of which the sacrifice of animals is an obvious illustration. Egypt was more likely than most other countries to perpetuate the traditions which a son of Noah had introduced. Hence it may not be too bold an assertion to lay down, that much of the Levitical ritual, excepting of course those parts of it which were based on their recent experience of miraculous interposition, was a selection of certain features of Egyptian

worship purified of its superstitions, and applied to the service of the true God.

We have already referred to the perfection to which the Egyptians had brought several arts. It will be readily observed how these arts were made available in the construction of the tabernacle, the weaving and embroidery of priestly garments, the moulding of the cherubim, the overlaying of the ark with gold, the chasing and embossing of the golden candlesticks. We may turn, however, to the correspondence of Levitical ordinances to Egyptian customs.

We will extract from Dr. Hawks' valuable chapter on this subject.

The Hebrew priests ministered at the altar and in the holy place with covered heads and naked feet, so did the priests of Egypt.

They were required to be scrupulously clean; bathing daily before they commenced their ministrations. Such was the rule also in Egypt.

All the priestly garments were to be of *linen*. The priests wore the *ephod*, encircled by a rich embroidered girdle. The breast-plate was another part of the priest's official dress. It bore twelve jewels, on each of which was engraved the name of one of the tribes. This, while it adopted an Egyptian custom, corrected Egyptian idolatry; for, on the breast-plate of the Egyptian priest was worn an idolatrous symbol, most commonly the winged scarabæus, the emblem of the sun. (All these Dr. H. shows correspond to the Egyptian practice.) The *Urim* and *Thummim* — In the Septuagint *δῆλωσις καὶ ἀλήθεια*. The words mean *light*, *truth*, or *justice*; and they were used to indicate the breast-plate which Aaron wore at certain times, on occasions connected with giving judgments. Wilkinson thus writes concerning the Egyptians: 'When a case was brought for trial it was customary for the arch-judge to put a golden chain around his neck, to which was suspended a small figure of Truth, ornamented with precious stones. This was in fact a representation of the goddess who was worshipped under the double character of Truth and Justice, and whose name Thmei (the Coptic name of justice or truth, hence the *Sémeis* of the Greeks) appears to have been the origin of the Hebrew *Thummim*, a word implying Truth.' The Egyptians were accustomed to put inscriptions on their houses, both inside and out. From this circumstance the Jews were prepared for the command which bade them write the words of their law upon their door-posts and their gates. When they made the ark, the size of it was particularly given. It is precisely the size of an ark carried after the statue of the god Chem, in a painting of the

the time of Rameses III. The Egyptians carried an ark or shrine in procession, and their mode of doing so was that adopted by the Hebrews.*

We might carry on this investigation at much greater length, but enough has been said to establish the fact that Egypt by its monuments bears witness to the truth of the Bible. We have already remarked that that wondrous land is rich in its remains. The past is written on the present, and modern students have eagerly inquired what message the ancients have transmitted? Egypt has been minutely searched, and not always by hands friendly to the truth of God. If the tablet could have been discovered that would have convicted Moses of imposture, many of these men would have eagerly displayed it before the eyes of Europe. But their efforts have led to an opposite result. Incidental testimony has abounded, and the scattered confirmations of the truth have been most convincing. We have only to wait with patience to see how the dynastic lists will be ultimately cleared from doubt and fable, and we shall then be only the more confirmed in the belief that no weapon brought against the Scriptures will prosper, but rather that it will be found to establish and not to destroy. Prophecy has long been known to have been minutely fulfilled in reference to Egypt. The desolation of Ethiopia above Syene, even the cessation of the 'paper-reeds by the brooks,' the foreign government, the 'removal of the gods,' are all indications that God has not spoken in vain. Egypt has yet to take its place among the nations; it will yet take a prominent part ere the 'way of the kings of the east is prepared.' It has not been cast altogether into oblivion. Like its imperishable structures, the recollections of the past are not effaced. We believe that Providence still watches over that land. Let us patiently abide the issue.

C. D.

* *Monuments of Egypt*, pp. 237, 238.

ON THE WORDS WHICH PAUL HEARD IN PARADISE.*

[Translated from the *OBSERVATIONES SACRÆ* of Campegius Vitringa the Elder.]

Argument.

It is inquired carefully what we must understand by τὰ ἄρρητα ῥήματα ἃ οὐκ ἐξὸν ἀνθρώπῳ λαλῆσαι, which were heard by the Apostle Paul in Paradise (2 Cor. xii. 4). Moreover, the interpretation is rejected which makes the words heard by Paul *unspeakable*, and impossible to be uttered by him. It is maintained, on the other hand, that Paul heard in heaven words not *unspeakable* indeed, but *not spoken* hitherto, and *to be told to no man*. Cameron,^b as defender of this exposition, is often commended; and the true signification of the Greek word ἄρρητος is illustrated by various examples. Further, it is sought whether we can assign by conjecture the nature of the words and truths heard by Paul in the highest heaven.

2 Corinth. xii. 1-4.—Κανχᾶσθαι δὴ οὐ συμφέρει μοι· ἐλεύσομαι γὰρ εἰς ὅπτασις καὶ ἀποκαλύψει κυρίον. οἶδα ἀνθρώπον ἐν Χριστῷ πρὸ ἐτῶν δεκατεσσάρων, εἴτε ἐν σώματι, οὐκ οἶδα, εἴτε ἐκτὸς τοῦ σώματος, οὐκ οἶδα, ὁ Θεὸς οἶδεν, ἀρπαγέντα τὸν τοιοῦτον ἕως τρίτου οὐρανοῦ. καὶ οἶδα τὸν τοιοῦτον ἀνθρώπον, εἴτε ἐν σώματι εἴτε ἐκτὸς τοῦ σώματος, οὐκ οἶδα, ὁ Θεὸς οἶδεν, ὅτι ἠρπάγη εἰς τὸν παράδεισον, καὶ ἤκουσεν ἄρρητα ῥήματα, ἃ οὐκ ἐξὸν ἀνθρώπῳ λαλῆσαι.

The very learned Cameron has indeed anticipated some of those remarks which I think of bringing forward for the exposition of the ἄρρητα ῥήματα, *unsaid words*, heard by Paul in Paradise. Instead, however, of his diligence checking my efforts, it has rather urged them on. Let us then essay the matter. These are Paul's words touching himself caught up into Paradise (2 Cor. xii. 4); καὶ ἤκουσεν ἄρρητα ῥήματα, ἃ οὐκ ἐξὸν ἀνθρώπῳ λαλῆσαι.

The term ῥῆμα, in the New Testament writings, usually means

* This dissertation, on a subject of high and curious interest, is an excellent specimen of the learned and exhaustive manner in which the elder Vitringa treated whatever subjects engaged his attention. It was part of an original plan to reproduce in English some of the more remarkable of the treatises furnished by the profound scholars and able divines of a former age, who are now but little heeded in this country; and the present article will be accepted as evidence that this intention has not been abandoned.—EDR. J. S. L.

^b John Cameron died at Montauban, 1625.—Th.

word, or *thing*; answering in both senses to the Hebrew רֵדָה, which is used both for *thing* and *word* (see examples in Vorstius).^c But there can be no doubt which of these senses ought here to be chosen: for Paul says that he 'heard' certain ῥήματα. But it is clear that *hearing* must be understood of *words*, not of *things*, as Calvin has already rightly said.

But the words which Paul heard in Paradise are said to be ἄρρητα, which seems capable of admitting a threefold signification. Τὸ ἄρρητον is commonly said to denote,—1. What has not been said hitherto; 2. What must not be said; 3. What cannot be said or explained. Cameron, however, who had a surpassing knowledge of the Greek language, denied that this word is ever used in the last signification. Let us hear him:—'Certainly,' he says, 'ἄρρητον, in the Greek tongue, signifies two things only, so far as we have been able to observe, to wit, what is not said, or what must not be said. But that that is called ἄρρητον which can in no way be exprest in any tongue, can scarcely be granted by those whose ears are accustomed to the Greek idiom.' This, however, which is denied by Cameron, is very generally allowed by great scholars, who render τὸ ἄρρητον by *unspeakable*. So Valla, Vatable, Beza, and the Dutch. These are Beza's words: 'Unspeakable, ἄρρητα, that is, which cannot be explained by speech to any man; as Aphrodiseus^d speaks of ἄρρητους ἰδιότητας, properties which are called hidden, and the principle of which cannot be perceived, and much less explained.' This example, as proof of this signification of the word, I see is produced also by Stephens and by Constantine.^e But certain ἰδιότητες, qualities, may be called ἄρρητοι, secret or hidden; not that it is impossible to explain them, but that they have not hitherto been explained. We are unwilling, however, that this our discussion should be merely one of words. Let be; let τὸ ἄρρητον mean, *that which cannot be exprest by speech*. We ask whether this signification of the word suits this passage. Very many learned interpreters have so thought. Let us see whether they have thought soundly and aright.

i. If by τὰ ἄρρητα ῥήματα we should understand *unspeakable words*, then Paul would seem to contradict himself. For he says that he himself has *heard* those ῥήματα which he calls ἄρρητα. That, however, which Paul heard, was certainly pronounced and uttered by speech. But how can what was really said, and Paul

^c *Phil. Sac.*, l. i. c. ii. p. 27, 28.

^d Alexander Aphrodiseus, or Aphrodisiensis, of Aphrodisias in Caria, one of the earliest Greek commentators on Aristotle, flourishing in the end of the second and the beginning of the third century.—Ta.

^e Robert Constantine, author of *Lexicon Græco-Latinum*, 1592.—Ta.

heard

heard spoken, be called *ἄρρητον*, unspeakable? ii. If these words were absolutely in this sense unspeakable, why does Paul add *καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀνθρώπῳ λαλῆσαι*? For if *ἄρρητον* means *that which no one can speak*, then, surely, Paul either needed not to add that these words were not *lawful* to utter (for what cannot be done is in vain forbidden), or, at least, directly lessened and weakened thereby the emphasis of the former word. For that *something is not lawful to do*, is saying less than that *it cannot be done*. The celebrated Cocceius, considering these two difficulties, has indeed come to the conclusion that the words which Paul heard are not absolutely called *ἄρρητα*, unspeakable, but are so called only in relation to him who heard them. This he so explains afterwards that we have no reason to differ very much from him.

I would urge this a little more closely, and show that the difficulty of this interpretation is not to be slighted. That certain *ῥήματα*, words, are called *ἄρρητα*, unspeakable, may be understood, either with relation to the *words* or *phrases* to be uttered, or to the *things* that are exprest by those words, phrases, or sentences. A certain word may be called unspeakable when there is such an arrangement of vowels and consonants therein, that the movement proper for uttering it cannot be produced in the mouth, in which sense Pliny¹ has called certain words unspeakable. But the *ῥήματα* which Paul heard cannot be said to have been unspeakable in this sense, since Paul heard them spoken, as has already been said. It remains then that these *ῥήματα* are called *ἄρρητα*, unspeakable, by reason of the *things* contained therein. That is to say, the things declared to Paul were so exceedingly sublime that they cannot be conceived and apprehended with distinctness by the mind of man, and hence cannot be well exprest by human speech, not even of the Apostle Paul. Thus most interpreters might wish to have the sense of this passage expounded. And it also fell out when I was leaning this way, that as I compared this saying of Paul with the style of Maimonides, in his treatise *de Fundamentis Legis*, I found that Maimonides had treated of the absolute simplicity of God, in connection with which is the following *דבר זה אין כח בפה לאמרו ולא באון לשמעו ולא בלב* — moreover this thing (word) cannot be spoken by the mouth, nor heard by the ears, nor clearly known by the mind of man. The phrase *דבר אין כח בפה לאמרו* might seem to be one and the same with *ῥήματα ἄρρητα* in our passage. Thus *ῥήματα ἄρρητα* would be *ῥήματα*, words, *περὶ τοῦ ἄρρητου τοῦ Θεοῦ*, spoken touching that in God which is to us

¹ *Hist. Nat.*, l. xxviii. c. ii.

incomprehensible and unspeakable, in much the same way as Clement of Alexandria has expressed himself respecting this subject.

But this interpretation has its inconveniences. First. If the things unfolded to Paul were not very clearly perceived and understood by him, and indeed could not be perceived by himself and others, it seems meaningless to add ἃ οὐκ ἐξὸν ἀνθρώπῳ λαλῆσαι. For when he says it is not *lawful*, λαλεῖν, to speak or utter them, he quite seems to imply that it is *possible* to utter them. I suppose lawful and unlawful are said of things which are in our power. Secondly. Granting that sense of these words, it is not very manifest what may have been the peculiar privilege of Paul beyond other believers when he was caught up into heaven. Yet who can doubt that it was very great? Shall we say that the peculiar favour vouchsafed to Paul was to hear either Christ or the angels discoursing of things which he was far from compassing, and which no mortal can compass? Indeed, even to us on this earth, truths are unfolded of such a kind that our minds cannot comprehend all their measure and amount. Therefore what happened to Paul in heaven amounts to nothing for which he could *boast* beyond ourselves. Thirdly. Even if we suppose that Paul heard in heaven discourses touching things which it was not given him fully to understand, yet we cannot think that Paul compassed absolutely nothing of those things. We cannot but believe, nor can it be, but that God, when he would unfold to Paul certain truths, laid them out clearly and manifestly enough. Had He been unwilling thus to act, why bestow so remarkable a favour on Paul? Neither can we doubt of this, that Paul comprehended in his own mind somewhat, at the least, of that which was said clearly to himself. But, indeed, if we would suppose that truths were unfolded to Paul, which in all their measure he could not comprehend by his own reason, yet he knew and was in a position to know τὸ ὅτι^ε (the matter of fact) of that revelation. He knew what was τὸ ὑποκείμενον^h (the subject) of that revelation, and what was predicated thereof. But if Paul understood that, which I have no doubt of, he could not call it absolutely ῥήματα ἄρρητα, unspeakable words. For he knew what may have been said to him, and what was said he could surely tell again to others. The man who discourses to me of the eternity, the omnipresence, the necessary existence of God, speaks of truths which I do not

^ε Ζητοῦμεν δὲ τέτταρα· τὸ ὅτι, τὸ διότι, εἰ ἔστι, τί ἔστιν. "Ὅταν μὲν γὰρ, πότερον τὸδε ἢ τὸδὲ, ζητῶμεν, εἰς ἀριθμὸν θέντες· ὅλον πότερον ἐκλείπει ὁ ἥλιος, ἢ οὐ; τὸ ὅτι ζητοῦμεν. Aristot. *Analyt. Post.*, ii. 1.—TR.

^h Τὸ ὑποκείμενον, the subject of a proposition:—the predicate, τὸ κατηγορούμενον. v. Aristot. *Categor.*, 2, 3.—TR.

fully

fully compass. What, however, is said clearly to me touching those truths, although I do not altogether compass, I can *rehearse* to others. Wherefore, even though we suppose that the highest mysteries of the Divine essence were dealt with before Paul in heaven, yet Paul could declare to the churches the *matter* which was treated of in that school of heaven, what was explained touching it, what the manner and what the order of explanation, what he understood of that exposition. Whatsoever has been said before me, even on any subject, surely it belongs thereto that it can be repeated by me in rehearsal, and hence it does not seem possible that in this sense it should be so fitly called unspeakable or unsayable. Fourthly. That Paul in heaven learnt remarkable truths, and compassed them well enough, seems quite manifest from ver. 7, where he speaks *περὶ τῆς ὑπερβολῆς τῶν ἀποκαλύψεων*, of the *abundance of the revelations* made to him. Paul does not say merely that there happened to him *ἀποκάλυψις*, revelation, but *ἀποκαλύψεις*, revelations. But of what kind? Of things unperceived? Surely the word *ἀποκάλυψις* properly signifies a clear manifestation and unfolding of truth. It is true that of yore certain things were sometimes revealed to the prophets which they did not at that time fully understand. Yet they were such as God willed should be at some time understood. For, as God does nothing, he likewise reveals nothing in vain. But He would reveal in vain if what He reveals were not understood by men. He had therefore revealed in vain certain things to the prophets of bygone times, had He not willed that they should be understood by the Church of following times. Apply this to the question in hand. If anything was revealed to Paul which he did not compass, it is not manifest what was the fruit of that revelation. For thus there was no revelation made to Paul such as he could set forth in writing to be understood by the Church of the following age. But it was made for Paul's sake alone, that he might thence gather some fruit. But what fruit could he gather from the mere general understanding that discourses were holden in heaven touching deep mysteries which he comprehended not? Besides that, the prophetic revelations were of quite another kind than the teachings which a man receives by the distinguished favour of God. Some prophet may be caught away by the Spirit to utter words which he does not understand, and bears in such case the character of an organ; but for them whom God treats as disciples taught by Himself, it behoves that He lay out the truth according to their apprehension, in such a way that their minds may be able to embrace it. Paul speaks besides of the *abundance of the revelations*, and of a *thorn fixt in his flesh*, lest he should thereby be exalted above measure. If Paul in this
ravishment

ravishment into heaven had not learnt more plainly some certain truths, which were not known also by others of the flock, believers and teachers, there was the less cause for pride, the less matter of temptation. For the ravishment into heaven, though in itself a great favour, must be regarded as less by far, if considered apart from the revelation made there to Paul as a distinguished friend of the Lord Christ, touching certain mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, which neither had been imparted hitherto, nor were to be imparted to others on this earth. Fifthly. Had Paul wished to say that he heard in heaven discourses touching some properties and mysteries of the Divine essence, which were such as he could not himself fully perceive and set forth, it is not likely that he would have expressed that by *ρήματα ἄρρητα*, unspeakable words; for that does not seem quite the phrase to be used here. The unspeakable words, indeed, are words touching things which cannot be understood, and which also therefore cannot be expressed by speech! Why not rather have said that he heard in heaven *ἀκατάληπτα*, (incomprehensible (words)), or *ἀνέφικτα* ((words) beyond reach)? An affection, a power, a deed, or what other thing soever it be which hovers so large in our conception, that we can hardly fashion words to equal the conception thereof, may sometimes be said to be *ἄρρητον*. Thus poets have spoken of *unutterable grief, unutterable love, unutterable deed, unutterable punishment*; but it seems to me different and harsher by far that *ῥήμα*, word, should be called unutterable or unspeakable. Surely that is not equally fitting to be said *περὶ τοῦ ῥήματος*, of word, less still of dogmas and doctrinal notions, which can be clearly and distinctly delivered and set forth, at least so it seems to me.

For the rest, as the words heard by Paul are not very fitly called *unspeakable*, if regard be had to *the things said*; so it seems to me that that description is not very rightly applied to *the manner of utterance* in which these words were spoken. It may indeed be doubted whether Paul does not deny that the words which he heard in heaven can be made known, on this account, that such was the gravity and greatness of the speaker, such the fulness, powerfulness, beauty, and, in a word, such the weight of the sayings; furthermore, that he who heard these words was encompassed by so great a brightness, that if he would rehearse any of those words again, his own speech would forthwith fail, and he would sink far below the greatness and fulness of the sayings. Indeed some great scholars are accustomed to mingle this interpretation of their own with the former, and of both to make up one. But it seems to me harassed with nearly the same difficulties as the above. First. When God, or the Son of God, who

who is at the right hand of his Father in heaven, speaks with men, there can indeed be no doubt but that His speaking is in greatness and force most exceeding; but that *the words* said by God should therefore be called *unspeakable*, does not seem possible. For although the language of the speaking God commend itself by peerless greatness, gravity, fulness, powerfulness, and beauty, it is always clear and distinct; and therefore, in this regard, is not very fitly said to be *ἄρρητος*, unspeakable. How great was the manifestation of God on Mount Sinai to the Israelites! What the gravity of His speaking! Yet it was not therefore wickedness to hand those words in writing down to posterity. With what brightness did God show himself to Isaiah and Ezekiel! What weighty and undefiled words did He shed forth before them! Yet neither did they therefore feel them to be *ἄρρητα*. For although God speaks with the utmost greatness, He always speaks clearly, that is, speaks so as to be understood by them whom He speaks with; who, it may be, cannot be followers of God in the whole *manner of utterance*, yet are not therefore unable to rehearse the sayings of God. Secondly. He who by merely telling rehearses again what he has perceived as said clearly by God, must not be thought to rehearse the words of God without their own manner. He cannot, I acknowledge, show forth to others the greatness of the speaking God. Yet every word of God, to whomsoever and at whatsoever time said, to whomsoever and at whatsoever time, set forth and rehearsed again by others with faithfulness, hath always *κρίτηρια* (marks) of the word of God. God says, in Jeremiah xxiii. 28, 29, that His word is *ῥῖ wheat*, that is, there is in it somewhat to fill the mind; that it is like a *fire*, searching out and judging the hidden longings of the mind; and a *hammer which breaketh the rock in pieces*, bending even the hardest hearts. To every word of God, if only it be faithfully reported, there belongs peculiar weight, solemnity, and force, by which man's conscience is overcome. It is not *chaff*, that is, it is not the word of man, but truly the word of God. The word of God, therefore, cannot be rehearsed without its own manner, if only it be faithfully set forth. Wherefore, even if that word be reported by man, yet nothing of its value is lost thereby. Nor is it needful here to search out many reasons by which that may be proved. For we have to this day *τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον*, the word of prophecy, spoken by God to seers of yore. We have the words of Christ in the Evangelists, and especially in John. Their value is not lessened thereby, that both prophets and Evangelists have reported and declared them to us in writing. In truth, I am unable to see well what may be the difference between words said to Paul and those which were said to the prophets; unless Paul
heard

heard the words of God or of Christ in other circumstances. Nor further, do I see why the words heard by Paul can be called *unspeakable*, rather than those which were said to prophets and apostles, if we have regard to the *manner of utterance* only.

It remains then, that ῥήματα ἄρρητα are words, either *not said hitherto*, or which *must not be said*. Both of these significations belong to the word ἄρρητος. For the former, I will give a remarkable example from Xenophon, who in the history of his Cyrus speaks thus: I. vi. 14; ἐπειδὴ δὲ καὶ τοῦτο παντάπασιν ἄρρητον ἐφαίνετο, τέλος δὴ με ἐπήρου, ὅ τι ποτὲ διδάσκων στρατηγίαν φαίη με διδάσκειν: 'but when *nothing at all was said* about this also' (by him who had taught Cyrus, or at least professed that he had taught him), 'at last indeed you asked me' (Cambyes asked Cyrus, whom indeed, when about setting out against the Assyrians together with Cyaxares, he reminds of precepts before given touching the art of a general), 'what at all he said he had taught me in teaching the duties of a general?' This is a clear instance in which τὸ ἄρρητον means *what has not been said hitherto*. Τὸ ἄρρητον is taken in the same sense by Homer. An instance is suggested to me by Stephens from the 'Odyssey,' book xiv., not far from the end:ⁱ

καὶ τι ἔπος προέηκεν ὅπερ τ' ἄρρητον ἔμεινον·

'and sent forth some word which would have been better unsaid.'

Ulysses proclaims wine to have such virtue as easily to drive a man to say what he has not said hitherto, and what it is better to be silent about.^k So with Hesiod near the beginning of his poem, 'Works and Days,' ἄρρητος is taken for a person *obscure*, and so not often named or to be named, or ignoble: line fourth—

ῥητοὶ τ' ἄρρητοὶ τε, Διὸς μεγάλου ἔκητι;

'both noble and ignoble are by the will of Great Zeus.'

Dionysius of Halicarnassus, also, takes the word in this signification, relating to another matter, if we are to abide by the version of Sylburgius,^m 'Hist. Rom.' b. i. p. 55. When dealing with the history of the gods of Troy, he relates that *Chryses, daughter of Pallas, when she married Dardanus, brought as a dowry sacred things of the great gods, whose mysteries she had learnt: but that Dardanus built a temple to them in Samothrace, ἀρρήτους τοῖς ἄλλοις ποιοῦντα τὰς ἰδίας αὐτῶν ὀνομασίας, καὶ τὰς τελετὰς αὐτοῖς, τὰς καὶ εἰς τόδε χρόνου γενομένας ὑπὸ Σαμοθράκων ἐπιτελεῖν*:

ⁱ Line 466.

^k I shall somewhat boast,
By wine befooled, which forces even the wise,
To carol loud, to titter, and to dance,
And speak what oft were better far suppress.

COWPER'S *Odyssey*.—Tr.

^m Editor of the Frankfort edition, folio, 1586.—Tr.

nemine communicato eorum nomine proprio, ritusque illis instituisse, quibus et hodie mos est initiari in Samothraciâ: their peculiar name being made known to no one, he also appointed rites to them, into which to this day men are initiated in Samothrace. Thus the translator. Perhaps, however, the word ἄρρητος might here also hold the signification in which it is taken for *that which must not be made generally known*, which is *not to be expressed*, and is not to be manifested, so as for the sense then to be, that Dardanus rendered those names of the gods such as were to be kept secret, ἄρρητα, to those who had not been initiated into these sacred things. Perhaps that use of this word might be more clearly shown by another passage of Dionysius ('Antiq. Rom.' ii. p. 100), which describes the rise of the festival of Consus, instituted by Romulus, in which, besides other things, sacrifices were offered on a certain subterraneous altar,^a which Dionysius conjectures was built δαίμονι ἄρρητῳ τινὶ βουλευμάτων κρυφίαν ἡγεμόνι καὶ φύλακι, *genio cuidam, cujus nomen proferri nefas sit, occultorum consiliorum duci et custodi.* Thus the translator. We should prefer to render, *whose name has not been known or said*, and therefore cannot be disclosed. Δαίμων ἄρρητος is θεὸς ἄγνωστος; the phrase of Acts xvii. 23. But this word is sufficiently received in that other signification in which τὸ ἄρρητον is taken for *what must not be said*. Numerous examples offer in the lexicons. Doubtless they who of yore, whether priests or philosophers, treated of God and the secrets of the Divine Nature, took great care not to manifest to all without distinction, by an open and clear display, what they were perceiving concerning the gods and spiritual things; but when discoursing before the vulgar of the Highest God and His Nature, to employ resemblances and representations; when indeed of the other gods, fables: but to entrust that secret lore, under a sacred promise of silence, only to those who longed after the truth and were initiated. For they thought, as Macrobius says in discoursing about this ('In Somn. Scipion.' I. ii.), *that an open and naked display of herself is unfriendly to Nature.* Moreover those doctrines of natural or mystic theology entrusted secretly to some, but *not to be published* to others, were everywhere called μυστήρια ἄρρητα and ἀπόρρητα, *things to be concealed, secrets, and not to be published* to others, of which kind were those of Mater Deûm, Hecate, Bacchus, Mithras, Orpheus, and in Egypt, Isis; especially however those celebrated Eleusinian ones of Ceres and Proserpine: these elsewhere are reviewed by

^a This festival was solemnized every year in the circus, by the symbolical ceremony of uncovering an altar dedicated to the god, which was buried in the earth.—Dr. WM. SMITH'S *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities*, Art. *Consualia*.—Tr.

Casaubon ('Ad Annal. Baron. Exercit.' xvi.). Indeed nothing is more frequent in ancient history. Diodorus clearly says of the Egyptian priests ('Biblioth.' Lib. I. p. 16): *Moreover concerning the sepulture of those gods* (Osiris and Isis) *many disagree*, διὰ τὸ τοὺς ἱερεῖς ἐν ἀπορρήτοις παρεληφότας τὴν περὶ τούτων ἀκριβείαν, μὴ βούλεσθαι τ' ἀληθὲς ἐκφέρειν εἰς τοὺς πολλοὺς ὡς ἂν καὶ κινδύνων ἐπικειμένων τοῖς τ' ἀπορρήτα περὶ τῶν θεῶν μηνύσασιν εἰς τοὺς ὄχλους; *because the priests having received under seal of secrecy an exact knowledge of these things, are unwilling to utter the truth openly, since dangers threaten those who divulge the secrets of the gods.* That the same was the usage of philosophers appears from Aristophanes amongst others ('Clouds,' Act I. scene ii.). Old Strepsiades is introduced as so lustily kicking against the door of the school of Socrates, that a disciple of Socrates complains, that some thought, but just now formed in his mind, had dropped from him at that knocking. And when the old man asks *what thing it was*, the disciple answers—

‘ἀλλ’ οὐ θέμις πλὴν τοῖς μαθηταῖσι λέγειν :’
‘but it is unlawful to tell any but disciples.’

The old man replies—

‘λέγε νῦν ἐμοὶ θαρβῶν. ἐγὼ γὰρ οὐτοσὶ
ἥκω μαθητὴς εἰς τὸ φροντιστήριον :’
‘speak freely ; for I myself here
am come to this thought-shop as a disciple.’

To which the disciple answers—

‘λέξω. νομίσαι δέ σε ταῦτα χρηὴ μυστήρια :’
‘I will tell you—but you must regard these things as mysteries.’

But those most renowned ones of Ceres and Proserpine were especially, as I said, thus called, which Diodorus treating of says, *περὶ ὧν οὐ θέμις ἱστορεῖν κατὰ μέρος, of which we must not speak particularly* ('Biblioth.' v. 224). Concerning them this of Hesychius must be taken (in voce σεμνά); σεμνά τῆς σῆς παρθένου μυστήρια. Σοφοκλῆς. τὰ ἄρρητα καὶ ἀνεξήγητα μυστήρια, *the mysteries of thy virgin are venerable: Sophocles. Mysteries which must not be spoken or explained.* By παρθένος is doubtless to be understood the κόρη, maiden, Proserpine, who was called ἄρρητος, as Hesychius expressly teaches. Alcibiades is spoken of by Plutarch as regarded as clearly convicted of publishing and profaning these. (In Alcibiad.) Justin says (lib. v.), *In the mean time Alcibiades, the exciter and leader thereof, being absent from Athens, is alleged to have told the sacred mysteries of the rites of Ceres, which were venerable by nothing more than by silence.* Moreover μυστήριον is rightly said to be ἄρρητον, since, according to the interpretation of

of Greek authors, *μυστήριον* signifies altogether the same as ἄρρητον. Suidas: *Μυστήρια. τελεταί. μυστήρια ἔκλησαν παρὰ τὸ τοὺς ἀκούοντας μύειν τὸ στόμα καὶ μηδενὶ ταῦτα ἐξηγεῖσθαι. μύειν δὲ ἐστὶ τὸ κλείειν.* 'Mysteries, sacred secrets, initiatory rites. They are called mysteries, because the hearers of them close the mouth, and tell these things to no one; for μύειν is, to close.' Certainly that which must not be told and manifested to another was called ἄρρητον, or ἀπόρρητον, a word very common with the Greeks. Without doubt Josephus ('Contra Apionem,' lib. II.) used the same Greek word,* where he repels the impudent slander of Apion, which said that king Antiochus, purifying the interior of the temple, found there a Grecian man, that was to be nourished and fattened according to the received custom in the same place, that at length he might be delivered up to death, as a victim consecrated to God. The Latin translator has there the word *ineffabilia*, for the Greek is wanting. These are the words of Josephus: 'At last' (he said), 'as he was weighing the matter' (he, that is the Grecian, fattening in the temple) 'he heard from the attendants that came to him the *unspeakable* (*ineffabilem*) law of the Jews.' By *legem ineffabilem*, understand νόμον ἄρρητον, a secret law which was not to be uttered openly. Josephus in answering the slander proceeds thus: 'For neither is anything further transacted of any *unspeakable* (*ineffabilium*) mysteries, nor is any feasting conducted within.' Again: 'He has moreover feigned the seizure of the Greek, the *unspeakable* (*ineffabile*) food, and the very abounding excellence of the provisions.' 'Unspeakable mysteries' (*mysteria ineffabilia*) are certainly ἄρρητα ἱερὰ, sacred secrets of religion to be divulged to no one. The Latins called them *silenda*. Livy says of the rites of Bacchus (lib. xxxix. cap. x.), 'imploping the favour and forgiveness of gods and goddesses, (the words are those of Hispala Fecenia, informing the young Aebutius concerning the rites of Bacchus) 'if constrained by love of him she had told what ought to remain unspoken (*silenda*).' Again the same Fecenia (cap. xiii.): 'she had great fear of the gods, whose hidden rites (*occulta initia*) she had told.' In a way of speaking altogether equivalent, the old soothsayer of Veii says in Livy (lib. v. cap. xv.), 'that perchance guilt is contracted by concealing (*tacendo*) what the immortal gods would have published (*vulgari*), not less than by uttering what ought to be concealed (*celanda effando*).'

But in which of these significations we ought to take the word ἄρρητος in this passage, I dare not determine with great confi-

* From the middle of section 5 to the middle of section 9 there occurs a lacuna in the Greek text, which is supplied by an ancient Latin translation quoted in section 8 above.—Tr.

dence. I doubt not but that concerning those 'words' which Paul heard in heaven, both might truly be affirmed, as well that *those words had not hitherto been spoken*, as that *they were not* to be divulged to others. They who embrace the latter signification here may say, that Paul by the following words, *ἃ οὐκ ἐξὸν ἀνθρώπῳ λαλῆσαι*, which it is not lawful for a man to utter, unfolds more clearly what he wishes to be understood by τὰ ῥήματα ἄρρητα. For in the latter signification that is properly ἄρρητον, ὃ οὐκ ἐξὸν ἀνθρώπῳ λαλεῖν, which it is not lawful for a man to utter. Nor is this interpretation of the passage unnatural; unless that according to this interpretation, the Apostle would say nothing new by the words *ἃ οὐκ ἐξὸν ἀνθρώπῳ λαλῆσαι*. By them however some new attribute of these words seems to be described. In this direction the simplicity of Paul's style seems plainly to point. Hence if it be so, it may certainly have been better for τὰ ἄρρητα ῥήματα to be interpreted of words not spoken hitherto, since doubtless they contained such a revelation of things as had not hitherto happened to the church. Perhaps the Vulgate translator was inclined this way when he rendered ἄρρητα ῥήματα in Latin by *verba arcana*. Concerning the Syriac at least the thing is plain,

whose version is, *ܐܠܗܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܢ*, and heard words not spoken hitherto, or which are not spoken. The attribute of these words is therefore twofold: the one, that they had not hitherto been spoken; the other, that they are not to be published to others. He intimates the former when he calls them ἄρρητα, *unspeoken*; the latter when he adds presently, *ἃ οὐκ ἐξὸν ἀνθρώπῳ λαλῆσαι*, which it is not lawful for a man to utter.

Most interpreters have referred the *οὐκ ἐξὸν* not only to the authority (potestatem) and right, but also to the power (potentiam) of telling what was heard; as if Paul had wished to say, that he heard such things in heaven as he neither was able fully to comprehend, nor could unfold in words. Thus Beza. *It is not lawful*, therefore, according to this interpretation, is nothing else than *it is not possible*. It is moreover considered that Paul, or any other man, was unable to speak those things which he had heard in heaven; since, according to them, those revealed matters far transcended the mind's compass, and therefore could not be unfolded in human speech. But we refuted this interpretation above in treating of the explication of the word ἄρρητος. It is asserted without reason that any one can discourse to me on any matter whatsoever, in a language that I know, in such a way that I cannot repeat and set forth to others, in some way, what has been 'heard.' Paul was able to say and unfold concerning what

what subject that discourse in heaven had been held ; with what beauty and greatness of style ; what and how much he himself had understood concerning that matter. That discourse therefore could not be called *unspeakable* in this sense. Here applies this remark of Cameron. He says :—

‘ Although *licet* in the Latin tongue, and ἐξέστιν in the Greek, signifies not only what is named authority (potestatem) and right, but also what is called power (potentiam), yet this is signified seldomer than that by this phrase. Again, this must be very particularly remarked, that in the New Testament books, *licet* always signifies authority (potestatem), *non licet* the denial of authority. Therefore we must not depart from the received signification of this word without weighty reason.’

I indeed have collected the instances of passages of the New Testament in which the words ἐξέστιν and ἐξόν are found, and I know for certain that Cameron has said the truth. What reason then is there for changing in this passage the signification of the expression, *non licet*, which is received in all others ?

This sense may therefore the rather belong to this language :— that Paul *heard words* which he might be able indeed, but *which it was unlawful for him to divulge*. But neither is all difficulty thus removed. For why does Paul write, ‘ which it is not lawful ἀνθρώπῳ for a man to utter ? ’ Certainly no man besides Paul had heard those ‘ words.’ Why then does he not say rather, *which it is not lawful αὐτῷ for him* (the man, to wit, to whom he says that revelation happened, since he speaks of himself figuratively in the third person) *to utter* ? The celebrated Cocceius thinks that this was added by Paul with the singular design of indicating *the excellence of Him who spake these words*. He says :— ‘ He who spake these words was not man.’ He proceeds : ‘ From John iii. 34, we understand that there are certain words of God which he who is of the earth cannot speak, since it is not lawful to him to speak except of the earth ’ (v. 31). ‘ It is therefore evident that the Apostle’s words are fitted for this, that they should intimate the excellence of Him who spake to him, to wit, that He was not man, that is, mere man, but greater than man.’ I believe that He who spake to Paul was greater than man. I well understand that He was able to speak words which Paul, in a certain sense, could not speak. But I do not equally compass, that, according to this explication, there happened in this heavenly revelation any remarkable privilege to Paul beyond many other men. The Israelites who heard God speaking from Mount Sinai, and saying, ‘ I am Jehovah thy God, who brought thee out of Egypt,’ in this sense ‘ heard words which it is not lawful for man to utter.’ The Apostles and all the disciples who heard
Christ

Christ say, 'I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life,' may be said to have 'heard words which it is not lawful for *man* to utter.' The same may be affirmed also of any other man you please, who heard God speaking in the word of prophecy. Thus Paul also could have heard Christ affirming many things concerning Himself which in this sense indeed 'it was not lawful for him to utter.' But we must observe—I. That the singular privilege of this revelation which happened to Paul could not consist in this, that Paul had heard Christ speaking 'words' which no one but the true God could utter; since every word of God and of Christ concerning themselves is such, that it is not lawful for me to repeat it in the sense in which God said it of Himself. II. That which God says of Himself (not in the first person) or of other matters, if it be not forbidden by a peculiar prohibition, it is quite lawful for me to repeat and relate to others, though God by far excels me. III. Even that which God says of Himself in the first person, and that also which Christ affirms of Himself in the same form of speech, it is not unlawful for me to repeat concerning God and Christ in the third person, and therefore that does not seem able to be fitly called, ῥῆμα ὃ οὐκ ἐξὸν ἀνθρώπῳ λαλῆσαι, 'a word which it is not lawful for a man to utter.' Christ says that *He is the truth*. It is lawful for me to say, *Christ is the truth*; or that I heard Christ say, *I am the truth*. As regards the passages quoted from John, it appears then: 1. That Christ, because He was from heaven, could know and speak exceedingly more, more clearly, and more certainly concerning God, than we mortals. 2. That there were certain reserved words which had not hitherto been spoken, now to be spoken by Christ as the Son of God and chief Prophet. 3. That Christ spake those words, and those which had been reserved to be said by Him. But however, if we are to take in this sense what Paul says, that he 'heard words which it is not lawful for man to utter,' then truly Paul was not favoured with a greater privilege than all they who heard Christ in the flesh speaking those words which had been reserved for Him as Messiah. This, however great the favour, does not come up to the emphasis of this text, in which Paul recounts some privilege as his, which he held to be altogether peculiar to himself.

Perhaps, therefore, it may be better to explain Paul's words—'which it is not lawful for a man to utter,' thus, 'which words it is lawful neither for me to publish nor for any other man endowed with like favour by Christ.' So that Paul does not indeed suppose that any other man knows the truths revealed to him, but only intimates ὑποθετικῶς, hypothetically, that they were truths of such a kind that it is altogether wicked to manifest them. Paul

seems to me indeed to wish to say, 'it is unlawful to publish these revealed matters; yea, if any other man had been caught up, or has been caught up, neither would that indeed be lawfuller for him to do than for me.' Cameron has taken it thus: 'To no one is it lawful to reveal matters of that kind, how great soever his authority, even were he an Apostle such as I.'

On the other hand, we may get over this difficulty in another, and that a convenient way. The word *ἄνθρωπος*, which in translating and expounding these words is usually referred to the preceding word *ἔξον*, may be referred to τὸ λαλεῖν. These words are usually divided by punctuation thus: *ἃ οὐκ ἔξον ἄνθρώπων, λαλῆσαι*, 'which it is not lawful for a man, to utter;'; but may conveniently be taken and separated thus: *ἃ οὐκ ἔξον, ἄνθρωπος λαλῆσαι*, 'which it is not lawful to utter (or explain) to man;'; that is, by the Hebrew idiom, 'which it is not lawful to utter to any.' For even learners know that the word *ἄνθρωπος* is used in this sense, like the Hebrew *בן* in the New Testament Scriptures. That the word *λαλῶν* indeed is taken in the sense of *declaring*, expounding, discoursing, and that when it is used in this signification, it is construed with the person *to whom*, and the thing *which* is declared, an instance may be found in the discourse of Christ in John viii. 40, *νῦν δὲ ζητεῖτέ με ἀποκτείνειν, ἄνθρωπον, ὅς τὴν ἀλήθειαν ὑμῖν λελάληκα, ἣν ἤκουσα παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ*, 'but now ye seek to kill me, a man that hath told you the truth, which I have heard of God.' And in another place, xvi. 1, *ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν*, 'these things have I spoken unto you (or declared).' The sense of Paul's words is therefore clear, and free from all difficulty, if we expound Paul's language in this manner: Paul *heard words*, not *spoken* hitherto, which *it was not lawful* for him *to reveal to any mortal*. Cameron makes some mention of this latter interpretation also, but thinks it of little weight, and of small importance whether the dative *ἀνθρώπων* be connected with the word *ἔξον* or indeed with the word *λαλῆσαι*. But I for my part decidedly think that that difference of construction must be attended to for the genuine sense of these words. For this our latter *ἐξήγησις* excludes almost all difficulties, and flows most easily.

But what? say you, were certain mysteries of the kingdom of heaven revealed to Paul which were not revealed to other believers, yea, which he must not reveal to others? Surely this seems a new and strange assertion. But does it seem so very harsh to thee, Christian reader, that to Paul, who laid out more labour in making known the glory of Christ Jesus, and in extending His kingdom, and who in extending it underwent more dangers and hazards than any other among men, yea, among apostles—it should be given by the extraordinary favour of the Lord
Christ

Christ to know and understand, whether concerning certain future events, or certain doctrines of our religion of more than common obscurity to the understanding, more than is given to thee, to me, or to other servants of God? Truly in such thing there is nothing which offends me. I am not ignorant, however, that Beza was averse to that opinion. He says—‘The Vulgate and Erasmus render ἀρρήτα by *arcana*. I. ἀπόρρητα, as if a man were able to explain them, but were forbidden from uttering them. Just as if there were in the Christian religion certain Eleusinian mysteries, and the Lord had not rather commanded all to be published: and indeed to them chiefly whom the world esteems unlearned and unskilful; and so in popular speech which might be understood by all, both highest and lowest, by men, boys, maidens; so, however, that all might be accommodated to the compass of the learners.’ He thus closes the discussion:—‘Therefore I cannot approve of that interpretation, unless you add this—that those things were not of such a nature that it was necessary to the salvation of the faithful that they should be unfolded.’ The last I agree with; the preceding not so well. For in the preceding, Beza seemed to reject all revelation whatsoever which is not presently to be published to all; but in the last he admits that some revelation of that kind may be given, if only it do not contain what is necessary for the salvation of believers to be unfolded. I yield to Beza. For no one of those maintain that some extraordinary revelation of things not to be published happened to Paul, ever, as I think, judged that that was a revelation of things to unfold which to the faithful is necessary for their salvation. For who could be so mad as to teach that it would have been wicked for Paul to utter things necessary for their salvation for believers to know? Beza accordingly grants that it is not absurd to judge that certain matters could be explained by Christ to Paul which it was not lawful for him to disclose to any, only on the condition that those matters are not necessary to be unfolded to the faithful for their salvation. Therefore it is unnecessary for us to argue further against Beza. It is certain that Calvin, who, from the solidity of his judgment and character, hardly ever endeavoured to draw from the words of Scripture anything beyond what he clearly perceived to lie in the *letter* of them, as the phrase is, nor easily allowed any expositions of Scripture which might seem to wander ever so little from common sense and the plainest principles of our science, here manifestly argues conformably with us. He says:—‘Now if any one ask what they (the words) may have been, the answer is short—that they are not unsuitably called unspeakable, that is, which it is wickedness to utter. But does some one infer that therefore what Paul heard was superfluous

and useless : for to what purpose did he hear what was to be held in perpetual silence ? I answer, that that was done for the sake of Paul himself ; for it behoved that he who was awaited by difficulties so painful, and which were enough to break a thousand hearts, should be strengthened in an extraordinary manner that he might never yield, but in stedfastness remain unconquered. Let us reckon a moment how many enemies his doctrine had, and what sort of men they were ; then how many engines it was assailed with. We shall wonder no further why he *heard more than it was lawful to utter.* Calvin seems to me to argue excellently. Would we, who are unwilling to resemble Paul in labours and dangers, obtain nevertheless from our Lord the like rewards of favour and honour ? Dare we, who by the fault of our dulness and sloth, reach not the higher step of spiritual knowledge, ask for ourselves a revelation of those things moreover which are known beyond what is written in the word of God ? Let us not be of so vain a mind. For it is vain to aim at a revelation of *words which have not* hitherto been spoken, if indeed thou dost not understand τὰ ῥήματα, *what has been spoken*, or wilt not earnestly apply thy mind to understand it.

Moreover, the hypothesis on which this interpretation rests will be, as I hope, easily admitted by all. For no one will say that the Church of God under the new economy has nothing further which she may learn by a new revelation. For there are certain things, leaving our faith and religion unhurt and entire, which we are ignorant of ; doubtless because it is not fitting to this state of the Church to know those things which God has kept back for another state and economy. For every state of the Church is defined by its own characteristics, which God the Most Wise Author of the economy has willed not to be confounded. Under the New Covenant it was necessary that words should be heard, and words were heard, such as were ἄρρητα, not spoken, under the Old Covenant. That is expressly taught in the New Testament writings (Matt. xiii. 17). ἀμὴν γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι πολλοὶ προφῆται καὶ δίκαιοι ἐπεθύμησαν ἰδεῖν ἃ βλέπετε, καὶ οὐκ εἶδον, καὶ ἀκούσαι ἃ ἀκούετε, καὶ οὐκ ἤκουσαν. 'For verily I say unto you, That many prophets and righteous men have desired to see those things which ye see, and have not seen them ; and to hear those things which ye hear, and have not heard them.' It was the part of the Messiah to *speak*, and indeed 'dark sayings of old,' חֲדָשִׁים קְדָמִים, aenigmata ab antiquo, that is, which from all ages have been esteemed as enigmas (Ps. lxxviii. 2). Not less clearly does Paul say (1 Cor. ii. 7-9) 'But we speak the wisdom of God ἐν μυστηρίῳ, in a mystery, τὴν ἀποκεκρυμμένην, even the hidden wisdom, which God ordained before the world unto our glory :
which

which none of the princes of this world knew : for had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory. But as it is written, Eye hath not seen, καὶ οὐς οὐκ ἤκουσε, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him.' The passage is taken from Isaiah lxiv. 4, which belongs to the New Testament times. It was necessary that that great Prophet, Christ, should speak τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ Θεοῦ, the words of God (John iii. 34), to speak which had hitherto been given to no one. For the rest, as God had kept back from those who lived under the Old Economy, ἄρρητα certain words to be heard under the New Covenant ; so He has kept back from those who live under the New Covenant (which is the wisest dispensation of God), ἄρρητα certain words to be heard in Paradise. For there all the ways of God will be more clearly and expressly declared to us in their own most wise order ; so that our present state on this earth is called in comparison with that, πίστις, faith, when the future is set before us by εἶδος, sight (2 Cor. v. 7). What if of these heavenly mysteries, the knowledge of which on this earth God wished, according to His dispensation, to be implicit, Paul had an earnest and a foretaste ? Through promise, Abraham 'saw the day of the Lord and was glad,' as the Lord witnesses in John viii. 56. What, I pray you, did Abraham see ? Moses under the law saw the 'back parts' of the passing God (Exod. xxxiii. 23). What do you suppose Moses saw ? I doubt not but that each of these was a vision of what was to be seen under the New Testament. If Abraham, through promise, could see something which was not granted to the other patriarchs to see ; if Moses under the law could see something which was not seen and understood by common Israelites, why could not Paul under the Gospel hear something which was not to be shared with other believers ? We may hold therefore that God was unwilling that the favour afforded to His distinguished friend should disturb the whole economy of the Church.

But besides this, to which it is my opinion that we may rightly agree, it may happen that those things which Paul heard in heaven, not to be told to others, were useful for Paul to know, but not for the Church. How so, say you ? What was useful for Paul to know, would not the same be useful for me to know ? Assuredly I think not that I speak ἀνύστατα (inconsistencies). What and what kind of mysteries do you suppose were shown to Paul in heaven ? Perhaps you stick at this, and accuse me of rashness, that the mysteries which I argue it was not lawful for Paul to show to others I do not guard against searching into myself. But I do not ask what was revealed to Paul ; that no one can know without revelation. I think, however, it is open to us to seek by modest guesses of what kind of mysteries this was a revelation ?

lation? That all was revealed to Paul which was unknown to him, cannot easily be believed, for it was necessary that Paul should be so treated in heaven that he might not quite forget his condition on earth, nor return to it altogether unlike his former self. What then will you except amongst things which could be revealed to Paul? Grotius, a man of free and penetrating faculty, has thus expressed his opinion on the matter: 'Just as Moses had understood all that dispensation by which God defended and ruled the Israelites, so Paul that by which Christ governs his Church: whence it follows, that he was fitter for giving counsel than Peter himself, who was regarded as chief in the Church. But these things which he had understood he was forbidden to utter.' The words of Grotius seem to me somewhat obscure. That Moses knew more than he wrote, I doubt not. Yet concerning the dispensation by which God defended and ruled the Israelitish people, it seems to me that sufficient is written by Moses. For not only what God wished to be done by the people, but also what should happen to the Israelitish people in various times and calamities, and what changes the Israelitish state should undergo, have indeed been told clearly enough by Moses, considering the age which he wrote in, and the people to whom he delivered his writings. Yea, from this very thing that Moses has in his writings so clearly set forth 'the dispensation by which God defended and ruled the Israelitish people,' Moses must be judged to have been *θεράπων πιστὸς ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ*, 'a faithful servant in all the house of God' (Heb. iii. 5). That the Apostle Paul, after the manner of Moses, knew 'the dispensation by which Christ,' under the New Covenant, 'governs his Church,' I might easily have granted; but I do not think, however, that this knowledge was entrusted to Paul like a mystery which must not be made public. For everywhere through his Epistles he unfolds 'that dispensation by which Christ governs' his New Covenant Church: and if by the will of Christ he was more clearly taught on this side than the other Apostles, and even Peter (which Grotius feels, and we do not now discuss), he has certainly declared the same to the Church more clearly in his writings than even the other Apostles. At least I do not see that what of this kind was revealed could be called *ῥήματα ἄρρητα*, 'unspoken words,' 'which it is not lawful to publish to any.' Besides which, it must be observed that the knowledge of 'the dispensation by which Christ governs his Church' is not of that kind that it must not be shared with the universal Church, since the revelation thereof might have been of great use to the universal Church.

Where then shall we rest? Did Christ declare rather to Paul

Paul those 'mysteries of the kingdom of heaven' which belong to the Divine essence and the economy of its persons, both in subsistence and in operation? Or did the Son of God unveil himself and his properties to the mind of Paul rather than to any other mortal? I might produce many reasons concerning it on this side and that, but I will not risk the doing of it, lest unawares I pass over the bounds of modesty or truth. There are many things revealed concerning those mysteries in the word of God: many also were said and written by Paul himself: although I do not doubt that a clearer revelation of them awaits us in the heavens. On another point my mind is made up, which I will express in few words.

The Scripture teaches clearly and expressly that there is somewhat which has not hitherto been revealed to the Church dwelling on earth. What that is, John explains in his First Epistle (iii. 2), *οὐπω ἐφανερώθη τί ἐσόμεθα*, 'it doth not yet appear,' he says, 'what we shall be.' This we certainly know, that everlasting life, everlasting joy, fulness of delights, await believers in Christ. We know that in that state we shall be most closely united to God; that according to our wishes and desires we shall enjoy Him; 'that we shall be like Him, and see Him as He is,' as John says in this same passage. Paul declares further, that in that state 'God will be all in all, and the Son himself be subjected to the Father' (1 Cor. xv. 28); that the functions of this animal life will then cease; and that the saints translated to a state of glory will be 'like angels' (Luke xx. 35, 36), and that their bodies will be clothed with brightness, immortality, and imperishableness (1 Cor. xv. 43, 44); yea, even that 'the whole creation' shall then be delivered from 'vanity,' to which it is now subject (Rom. viii. 20, 21). There is enough, therefore, revealed to us concerning that state for the stay and defence of our faith and hope against all the temptations of the devil, the world, and the flesh. But although this is said and revealed concerning that state, and John knew that it was said and revealed, yet he says, it is not yet revealed *what we shall be*, and he said so most truly. For concerning the order and economy of that state, as also concerning the order of all other things which God shall appoint according to His highest wisdom, we understand nothing distinctly; still less do we understand what our lot will be in those joys of the Lord. For that every believer will have his lot in that glory proportioned to the dispensation of Divine grace in this life, is not only required by the justice of God, but is also written down expressly in the Scriptures (Rom. ii. 6; 2 Cor. ix. 6). What if then in our ignorance we suggest whether, perhaps, Christ may have chosen to set forth to Paul
his

his most faithful servant, caught up into heaven, what is the dispensation not of this time only, but much rather of that future time, what its order, and especially what glorious lot would fall to himself in that blessedness, and what *reward* he had to expect from his Lord for so many labours and dangers as he was bearing for His cause? I see nothing harsh in this opinion; it quite satisfies the emphasis of words which Paul uses in this his narration. For a thing revealed of that sort may fitly be called ἀρρητον, since, as John clearly says, it is not yet made manifest. This it was not lawful for Paul to utter to any mortal; for, in the first place, God, according to His wisdom, for various reasons decreed on hiding the economy of that time and state of the universal Church. Therefore it was not useful that Paul should reveal it to the Church. Then again, this revelation concerned Paul more than it did the Church, for it was serviceable to Paul rather than to the Church to know the blessed lot which awaited Paul in the future life. For nothing could be revealed to Paul which in every mishap could bring him stronger comfort; which could more spur him on to labours, more cheer him on to bear afflictions, undergo dangers, neglect contempt, reproaches, the sorrows and troubles of this life, than this very thing. To which may be added, that Paul is accustomed to speak everywhere with so much effect and confidence of the reward which awaited him and the rest of the faithful, that almost from thence you may have gathered that concerning that mystery more was revealed to him than to others.

For the rest, as this catching up of Paul into heaven brings great comfort to the whole church of believers, and props up their hope, so it was a beam in the eyes of the heathen. That is evident enough from the Dialogue of Lucian or some other knave, which is entitled 'Philopatris,' as allusion is made therein more than once to this catching up of Paul into heaven, and the mysteries perceived there; and they are at the same time wittily laughed at. Triphon, who sustains in jest the character of a regenerate Christian, speaks thus in it: καὶ γὰρ πρῶην κἀγὼ ταῦτα ἔπασχον, ἅπερ σὺ, ἥνικα δὲ μοὶ Γαλιλαῖος ἐνέτυχεν, ἀναφλαντίας, ἐπὶ ῥῆνος, εἰς τρίτον οὐρανὸν ἀνροβατήσας, καὶ τὰ κάλλιστα ἐμμεμαθηκώς, δι' ὕδατος ἡμᾶς ἀνεκαίνισε, 'for I lately underwent the same as you, and when the bald-headed, long-nosed Galilæan came to me, who had past through the air into the third heaven, and learnt the finest things full well, he renewed us by water, &c.' Again Critias says to him, after Triphon had set forth the doctrine of the Christians concerning Creation and Providence, and Critias had offered the old belief concerning the Fates, 'Wherefore, Triphon, were you not willing

willing on account of this to add anything further concerning the Fates, *εἰ καὶ τύχα πεδάριστος ἐγγόνεις, μετὰ τοῦ διδασκάλου, καὶ τὰ ἀπόρρητα ἐμνήσθης*, though by chance you had been lifted up on high with your teacher, and initiated into those mysteries? Here-upon, again, Critias is led to speak thus against the Christians, *οὐ γὰρ αἰδεροβατοῦντες ταῦτα ἠκνύετε*, 'for ye have not heard this by passing through the air.' But let this which the godless heathen have unholily scorned, be with us a reason of true and solid comfort. 'For we,' as many as believe in Christ, 'ourselves enter Paradise in Paul, and know that with him we shall there hear other words. For their (the Apostles') *ὄψις* and *ἀκοή* is our *ὄψις* and *ἀκοή* (sight and hearing), who know by the greatest reasons, that they saw and heard what they say that they saw and heard.' Thus piously speaks the celebrated Cocceius. Yea, truly on this we safely rest our hope. Neither, indeed, do we hold it needful either to feign other revelations of that kind, or easily to trust those that are feigned when they are narrated. For there are men, and were of old in great number in the Christian church, so foolish and stupid, that they sought to advance the cause of religion, or their own and others' credit, by inventions of their own deceit and trickery. Some one, indeed, under the name of Jerome, in an Epistle to Celantia, pretended that he had been 'caught up beyond the third heaven, and had seen more than Paul ever saw;' whom Erasmus deservedly censures as 'a pettifogger and deceiver.' It is difficult to excuse falsehood of this sort by any colour or pretence, yet I am inclined to believe that that fable had its origin in what Jerome himself relates in his Epistle to Eustochius (*De Custodiâ Virginitatis*, p. m. 52), as having happened to himself. These are his own words, more pleasing to monks of former ages than to the studious of our time. 'When many years ago I had cut myself off from home, parents, sister, kin, and, what is more troublesome than these, from the custom of somewhat dainty food, for the kingdom of heaven's sake, and went to Jerusalem to be a soldier, I could not be without the library which I had got together for myself at Rome with the greatest pains and toil. And thus wretched I fasted and read Tully. After frequent nightly watchings, after tears which the remembrance of past sins forced up from my lowest bowels, I would take up Plautus. If ever coming back to myself, I had begun to read the prophets, the rude style was terrible. And because with blind eyes I saw not the light, I blamed not my eyes, but the sun. Whilst in this manner the old serpent was mocking at me, about the middle of Lent, a fever spread through my marrow, attacked my weakened body, and my wretched limbs
were

were so wasted without rest, which may also be hard to believe, that I scarcely clave to my bones. In the meantime the funeral is prepared, and the vital heat of life, as the whole body was now waxing cold, throbbed quickly only in my bosom ; when suddenly being caught up in spirit, I am dragged to the tribunal of the Judge ; where there was so great a light, and so great a shining from the brightness of things around, that being cast to the ground, I durst not look upwards. Asked concerning my state, I answered that I was a Christian. Then He who was presiding said, "Thou liest, thou art a Ciceronian, not a Christian : for where thy treasure is, there will thy heart be also." Instantly I became dumb ; and amid stripes, for He had ordered me to be beaten, I was more tormented by the fire of conscience, thinking over that little verse within myself, "In the grave who shall give Thee thanks?" (Ps. vi. 5) Yet I began to cry out and say, wailing, have mercy upon me, O Lord, have mercy upon me. This voice sounded amid the stripes. At length they who stood near, falling down at the knees of Him who presided, besought that He would grant forgiveness to youth, and allow to error room for repentance : exacting punishment afterwards if I should ever read books of heathen literature. I, indeed, who, drawn up in such a critical situation, would have promised even more, began to swear, and calling His name to witness, say, —Lord, if I ever have worldly books, if I read them, I have denied Thee. Being let go on these words of oath, I return to the earth, and to the wonder of everybody, open my eyes, wetted with such a shower of tears, that I convinced even the unbelieving by grief. Nor had that been sleep or empty dreams, by which we are often mocked. Witness that tribunal before which I lay ; witness the sad judgment which I feared. Thus it can never happen to me to have such a doubt, that I had black and blue shoulders, that I felt the stripes after sleeping, and that from that time I read Divine things with such a relish as I had not before read human.'^p The intelligent and God-fearing student
of

^p Neander's remarks are interesting :—' Now when Jerome, in the midst of the severe ascetic discipline to which he had subjected himself, felt his conscience reproach him on account of the predilection he had hitherto shown for Pagan literature, we may easily explain how it might happen that, in a violent attack of fever, brought on by his rigid austerities and his abstinence from food during the Quadragesimal fasts, his thoughts should shape themselves into that vision which, by his own fault and that of his later antagonist Rufinus, became magnified to an undue importance.

' This oath he assuredly did not consider himself bound strictly to keep, as is proved by the frequent accurate quotations from ancient authors in his writings ; unless, indeed, we credit the solemn assurance of Jerome himself, in answer to the charge of perjury brought against him by Rufinus, that he made all these citations simply

of literature will read this narrative with such discretion, that whilst he does not think he must neglect Cicero, yet neither will he endure to compare the pleasures of reading Tully with the delights of the Divine Word.—C. W.

INSPIRATION.

THE subject of inspiration is one of primary importance, and one to which it is indispensably necessary that every Christian should turn his attention if he would be able 'to give a reason for the hope that is in him.' It is, in fact, the doctrine on which every other part of the Christian system depends, since if God is not the author of the Scriptures, what ground have we to believe their statements when they declare that God is in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them? There is perhaps no subject on which, among those who claim the name of Christian, greater diversity of opinion exists. One class maintain that the Scriptures are all inspired, but not all in the same degree; another, holding what may be called an intermittent theory of inspiration, believe that the Scriptures are not all inspired, but only certain portions of them relating to 'essential religious truth'; and a third adhere to the opinion that the Scriptures are verbally and plenary inspired. On the first of these we shall not at present say more than that it has no foundation in Scripture; but, professing ourselves adherents to the plenary theory, our object in the sequel will be to take up and examine certain arguments against that opinion which appeared in a recent number of this Journal.^a The writer of that article has embodied his remarks under two heads—to each of which we shall briefly advert.^b

I. The

simply from memory. Possibly he differed in his own judgment respecting this vision in different moods of minds, passions, and situations. Where he wished to dissuade from the reading of the heathen authors, he represented this as being a supernatural vision, and thus furnished Rufinus a good reason for accusing him of self-contradiction and of perjury. And Jerome could adduce nothing in his own vindication, except, first, that he had really read no pagan author since his conversion, and cited everything from mere memory—a statement against which Rufinus could urge many plausible objections; and secondly, that the whole was but a dream, and what was done in a dream was a thing of no account. This little trait is not without its importance, as opening a glimpse into the character of Jerome. Veracity or untrustworthiness of character is often indicated in the plainest manner by the merest trifles.—TORREY'S *Neander*.—Ta.

^a Vol. v. No. x., April, 1850.

^b In order that we may not misrepresent the author of that article, we shall quote his own statement of his opinion:—'We shall lay down and prove the two following

I. The author of the article referred to has gone to Scripture itself, holding rightly that it is the only source of evidence in favour of the universal plenary theory. We cannot, however, but regret that the plan to which he restricted himself of dealing with the subject in a 'negative' or destructive manner has prevented him from drawing proofs of his own theory from Scripture. But we conceive that such a manner of procedure may have sprung from a totally different source, viz. the entire absence of such a class of proofs. He will find many passages of Holy Writ which (to say no more at present) seem to teach the inspiration of the entire Scriptures, but we very much mistake if he will find one that even *seems* to teach that they are inspired only in part, or that their inspiration 'reaches only to the extent of essential religious truth;' and had there been a passage favouring his view possessing half the force real or apparent, which the passage 2 Tim. iii. 16 has for the theory which he combats, we doubt not it would have been eagerly brought up.

But to proceed to his remarks upon this passage. Admitting, as he ultimately does, and as every one who studies the passage thoroughly must do, that the most literal and correct rendering is—'all' or 'every Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable,' etc., he affirms that it contributes 'little to the support of the plenary theory,' and *that* because, 'although it predicates inspiration of the Old Testament Scriptures in the aggregate, it does not necessarily affirm or intend it of every part or every topic of the whole or each of them.' This assertion he supports by an appeal to the use of universal terms in the Bible. Now we readily admit that there is a considerable number of passages in which universal terms are used in limited significations, but there are at least as many in which they are to be used in all their plenitude of meaning; so that, in point of fact, the remarks which he has made upon such terms, instead of placing this passage among the class to which he has unhesitatingly consigned it, only compel us carefully to examine to which of the two classes it ought to be assigned. But more than this, we are in another part of the article^c told that such terms are insufficient alone to prove the point, unless it can be shown that there is something in the particular instance requiring us to understand it universally—*i. e.* every universal term must be understood in a limited sense,

following propositions. There is not evidence adequate to prove that Inspiration extended to every chapter and verse of the Bible, and to every subject therein treated of; but the positive evidence reaches only to the extent of **ESSENTIAL RELIGIOUS TRUTH**. There is evidence sufficient to prove that Inspiration *did not* extend to the former of these, *i. e.* to all parts and all subjects.

^c P. 442.

unless

unless there is something in the particular instance or in its context requiring it to be taken in its universal—a canon of criticism this, which sounds as strangely as if a painter were to inform us that by black we were to understand any shade of colour whatever, no matter how nearly it may approach to white, unless there is something in the particular case, to which reference is made, which binds us to understand it as jet black. We had always thought that we were bound to take universal terms wherever they occur in Scripture in their strictly literal, and therefore in their universal, sense, unless there is anything in the particular case which calls for limitation; and we affirm that there is nothing in the present case which necessitates the limitation of the universal term, but there is everything enforcing its literal signification. The words quoted from the Apostle confessedly apply only to the Old Testament Scriptures, which a little before he had styled *ἱερὰ γράμματα*, and which he now affirms to be given by ‘inspiration of God.’ It is contended, however, that the word rendered all (*πᾶσα*) does not denote absolute universality, but that it means the Old Testament Scriptures in the aggregate or as a whole. This meaning *πᾶς* undoubtedly frequently has, but it is not used arbitrarily, and there is generally something which points out when it is to be taken as equivalent to *ὅλος*. The rule upon the subject is that when *πᾶς* is used denoting totality, then the singular is put with a noun having the article; but when, as in the case before us, it is put with a noun without the article, it includes the idea of plurality, and is equivalent to *ἕκαστος*, each, all, every (see ‘Robinson’s Lexicon,’ *sub voc.*). We therefore maintain that the phrase *πᾶσα γραφή θεόπνευστος* means *every* writing—i.e. every part of those writings previously styled *ἱερὰ*, is inspired. To this interpretation the ‘*usus loquendi*’ of the language shuts us up, and the term must therefore be understood in all its universality.

But apart from the mere syntax, we affirm that the very nature of the case requires that it be so understood. To take an example from modern custom:—The editor, suppose, of a magazine informs the public on the title-page of his publication, that for all the articles contained in it he is responsible. Now we ask what interpretation does the nature of the case require to be put upon the word ‘all’ in this connection? Most certainly the words mean, if they mean anything, that the editor homologates *every sentiment* contained in *every* article of the magazine, unless he should declare that in some particular case he does not. And yet this is just a case in point, and similar reasoning, applied to the passage before us, would lead to the conclusion that every sentiment of every book of the Old Testament is θεόπνευστος—God-breathed—

breathed—inspired—*unless* an exception is expressly mentioned. And if such an exception had existed we may reasonably believe that the Apostle would have specified it, since from the position which he occupied in the Church, and the 'authority in which he was held, he might have presumed that his statements on such a subject would have been deemed satisfactory and conclusive; but no such exception is even hinted at, and the conclusion is that none exists.

But, still farther, the verse under consideration unquestionably proves that the Apostle expected to find not merely *essential* religious truth contained in the 'all scripture' thus inspired. It affirms that all scripture is divinely inspired and *profitable*—it does not say *essential*. The Apostle Paul, therefore, has a lower standard of what should be inspired than the writer whom we are combating. In inspiration he looks for the profitable as well as for the essential, and these are, we conceive, two different things. Truth may be profitable without being 'essential religious truth,' although all such truth is unquestionably profitable. For example, it would doubtless be difficult to find much essential religious truth in some of the historical books of the Old Testament, but no one will deny that these books are *profitable*. Indeed, an inspired man has declared that 'all these things happened unto them for ensamples, and they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come' (1 Cor. x. 11). In this view of the matter then, we think, the inspiration of a passage of Scripture is not impugned, even although it could be shown that it is not essential religious truth: it must be proved *unprofitable*; and we challenge any one to bring forward any part of the Scriptures which is utterly unprofitable. The tenth chapter of Nehemiah is not without its use.

But again, the writer of the article alluded to combats another class of passages, which have been brought forward in support of the plenary theory, viz. that in which the phrase 'word of God' occurs, and affirms that such passages 'furnish not an iota of evidence in the case.' We shall see. We concede at once that the phrase 'word of God' never in Scripture designates that collection of writings which we call the Bible; but we most emphatically deny the statement made, that 'it cannot be shown that these phrases are used in reference to a single book or passage (n. b. *passage*) of Scripture.' Why the prophetic books abound with such references of the very phrase. To open the Bible at random; look at Jeremiah xxi. 1. The *word* which came unto Jeremiah from the Lord (Jehovah) when king Zedekiah, etc. Then again as to its reference to a book—look at Hosea i. 1. The *word* of the Lord (Jehovah) that came unto
Hosea,

Hosea, etc. ; also ver. 2. The beginning of the *word* of the *Lord* by Hosea. (See also Mal. i. 1 ; Hag. i. 1 ; Ezek. i. 3 ; Jer. i. 1, 2, 9, 14 ; Isa. i. 2, 10.) But it is also said that 'it cannot be shown that it is ever used in reference to any other than a religious communication.' Observe the ground is now shifted : it was at first 'essential religious truth,' it has now dwindled into a 'religious communication ;' these, however, are very different things, since, from the very phraseology employed, it is evident that there may be a communication of religious truth, which is not essential. But, waiving this, will our author call the following passage essential religious truth or even a religious communication—'Thus saith the Lord God (Jehovah) of Israel, Behold I will turn back the weapons of war that are in your hands, wherewith ye fight against the Chaldeans, which besiege you without the walls, and I will assemble them into the midst of this city. And I myself will fight against you with an outstretched hand and with a strong arm even in anger and in great wrath,' etc. (Jeremiah xxi. 4-7). We think not. It may be a judicial communication, but we, at least, cannot see religious truth embodied in it, and yet it is ushered into our notice *claiming* inspiration in these words—'Thus saith Jehovah God of Israel.' Since, then, the phrase 'word of God' is used in reference to both passages and books of the Old Testament, even to such as have nothing of the element of religion about them, we cannot agree with the conclusion to which the writer comes, when he affirms 'that the texts where this and similar phrases occur do no more than support his theory ;' they do, at least, something different. They evidently contradict it. But it may be as well to state here that, although the phrase 'word of God' is never used of the whole Scriptures collectively, yet a nearly equivalent phrase is used to designate the collected writings of the Old Testament, as they existed in the days of the Apostles. Paul styles them (Rom. iii. 2) τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ. Will our opponent affirm that this clause furnishes 'not an iota of evidence in the case ?' All commentators are agreed that these words refer to the Old Testament Scriptures, and, let it be remembered, that, long before the Apostle uttered these words, the Old Testament canon had been completed, and the whole, as it existed in the days of the Apostles, is there recognized as forming the 'oracles of God.' It is as if (and we speak it reverently) Jehovah had himself inscribed his name, as its author, upon its title-page, since, here a writer, inspired by the same spirit which dictated the Old Testament, affirms that these Scriptures are God's oracles, and therefore that for all that is therein contained, he is responsible. And we rejoice that it is so—yea, God is responsible for the truth of the Scriptures—and
although

although opposition to his word may come from false philosophy, and science falsely so called; although a science, but yet in its infancy, may rise up and cast its stones against it—although many apparent discrepancies may exist between parts of it—and many incomprehensible statements may be made in it—yet we rejoice that a time is approaching, when the God who *composed* the Scriptures shall vindicate *his* truth and theirs, shall unfold their mysteries, explain their difficulties, and harmonize their differences. Concerning all these we rejoice in the assurance that we shall ‘know hereafter.’

The writer, on whom we are commenting, next proceeds to an investigation of the passages in the 14th, 15th, and 16th chapters of John’s Gospels, which, on this subject, have been considered as corroborative, if not conclusive, evidence in favour of the Plenary theory. It is stated by Christ (chap. xiv. 26), that the Comforter should teach his Apostles ‘all things, and bring all things to their remembrance whatsoever he had said unto them.’ The argument here turns upon the meaning to be assigned to the phrase ‘all things;’ and, as was to be expected, the universality of the terms in which the promise is conveyed, supplies a refuge for the advocates of the theory against which we are arguing; and we are told, that if these terms be understood as absolutely universal, then ‘Christ promised that every single thing, however *trivial, private, or personal,*^d whether concerning their meals or their occupations, or their journeyings—literally ‘*whatsoever he had said unto them, from the first moment to the last of their acquaintance with him, should be brought to their remembrance.*’ Let us observe the admission made in that expression ‘*literally whatsoever he had said unto them.*’ Does not the fact of these very words being quoted to explain the view he combats prove that *that* view is the one taught by the expression? This circumstance more than outweighs all the arguments which he has brought forth against the Plenary theory. But we are informed that, in our view of the case, the ‘all things must include *every single thing, however trivial, etc., which Christ uttered.*’ Now, we ask with what a view of the character of Christ are we presented in these words? It seems *he* too could be a trifier, and utter things trivial. Ah! no, he was too deeply engaged with the momentous matter of a world’s salvation—the work which his Father had given him to do—to stoop for once to the trivial.

‘No; he was serious in a serious cause,
And understood too well the weighty terms
That he had ta’en in charge.’

^d The italics are our own.

The writer has probably forgotten that Christ, in order, doubtless, to preserve himself from unnecessary care for the things of the world, delegated such unimportant concerns to his disciples, who, we are frequently informed, both bought and carried food, and one of whom 'bore the bag and what was put therein.' Still farther, it is urged that 'it is impossible for any one to believe that such universal reminiscence could answer any good purpose.' Now, it is not impossible: for we believe it, and can show good grounds for our belief. It is well known to every reader of the Gospel history, that throughout all the life of Christ upon the earth, his disciples looked upon him as a temporal sovereign; that even after his death the burden of their lamentation was, 'We trusted that it had been he who should have redeemed Israel;' and that, before his ascension, they asked him the question, 'Lord, wilt thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?' Now, we maintain that the universal reminiscence of what he had said, far from being useless and serving no good end, was indeed one of the greatest boons which could have been conferred upon them; since with their minds purified by the Holy Ghost imparted to them, and cherishing no longer the gross and earthly ideas of Christ's kingdom which they had formerly entertained, they would now be enabled fully to understand all the references to spiritual things which he had made—which, in fact, formed all his conversation with them, but which, from their own earthiness, they were then unable to comprehend—they would now be able in memory to revisit all the scenes through which they had passed with him, and to rehearse all the words 'whatsoever he had said unto them;' and by thus reading his language in the enjoyment of a clearer light, they would attain to a fuller and a clearer knowledge of the doctrines of the Gospel than they could otherwise have had. We believe, as firmly as any one can, that no miracle is performed without a necessity for it: and that where a necessity is wanting, there is '*a priori*' evidence for the absence of a miracle. But we think we have shown a necessity for it in the case before us, such a necessity, at least, as could only have been provided for by an equivalent *miracle*.

But it is farther said that, if we carry out this interpretation, then the Holy Ghost was to teach them 'all truth,' and therefore to communicate to them a perfect knowledge of the arts, sciences, etc. This conclusion does not, however, necessarily follow. The promise (John xv. 13) 'he will guide you into all truth' does not, we apprehend, mean that the Holy Ghost would furnish them with a complete answer to the question put by Pilate to our Lord, 'What is truth?' neither does it, on the other hand, restrict it to what our opponent would call 'essential religious

truth;' but it simply informs the Apostles that, after the Spirit had descended upon them, they were to place implicit confidence in all his promptings and guidance, for they would be true. It is equivalent to the phrase, he shall guide you into nothing but truth. And this is a manner of interpretation very common among the same class of passages; thus, to mention no other, James i. 16, 17, 'Do not err, my beloved brethren; every good gift and every perfect gift cometh down from above'—i. e. no gifts, except good and perfect gifts, come down from above. In this view of the passage, then, Christ promises, not a perfect knowledge of the sciences, arts, etc., but only that whatever knowledge of such things, as well as of others, which he gave, was to be held as correct and true. But, without insisting upon this, we are prepared to show that, whether or not Christ promised the Spirit only to teach all truth (understanding by that phrase all essential religious truth), he *did* teach them something which was not essential religious truth. It will be remembered that on the day of Pentecost, the Apostles spake with new tongues as the *Spirit gave them utterance*; now, both the power of expressing themselves in tongues to them previously unknown, and the sentiments expressed by them in these tongues, are here traced to the agency of the Spirit. Will, then, any one say that the mere power of speaking in tongues formerly unknown (apart, be it remembered, from the sentiments which were expressed in them) was 'essential religious truth?' We think not. It was a medium of conveying such truth, but, of course, formed no part of it any more than the wire of the electric telegraph forms part of the message which is transmitted along it. But it was part of the '*all truth*' into which they were guided by the Spirit. And if his guidance and influence imparted to them a knowledge of languages, correct so far as it went, is there any inconsistency in supposing that it also extended to every subject to the consideration of which their apostolic office led them? The gift of tongues is an undeniable fact, and it was traced to the influence of the Spirit. Why, then, may it not be inferred that a knowledge of history, chronology, and the like was divinely imparted, as well as a knowledge of language? Since, looking at them in the light of human reason, a knowledge of languages *might* have been attained *by their own unaided exertion*, as well as an acquaintance with history and chronology; and a miraculous impartation of the one is, humanly speaking, just as unnecessary as of the others. But more than this; we are prepared to prove that the Apostles claimed Inspiration, even when writing what was not essential religious truth. Fully admitting that the phrase 'the truth,' as used in the New Testament, is a synonyme for the Gospel, we can yet bring

bring forward a passage where the word 'truth' occurs in such a connection that it cannot be understood as referring to any of the doctrines of the Gospel, where, nevertheless, the Apostle claims inspiration in its utterance : Rom. ix. 1. 'Ἀληθεῖαν λέγω ἐν Χριστῷ, οὐ ψεύδομαι, συμμαρτυροῦσθς μοι τῆς συνειδήσεώς μου, ἐν Πνεύματι ἁγίῳ. Now, whatever the verses immediately following may be understood as meaning, the absence of the article before ἀληθεῖαν shows that the word does not here mean the truth of the Gospel—the truth as it is in Jesus. But a close inspection of verses 2nd and 3rd confirms this view of the matter, and shows that the *truth* of the first verse is the declaration of the state of the speaker's feelings towards his kinsmen the Jews, and not any portion of truth, the belief of which is *essential* to the salvation of the soul. This will be more evident if we give a short paraphrase of the passage. I, says the Apostle, a person in Christ, a justified person, declare what is true—my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost—when I say that I have great heaviness of heart for my Jewish brethren; so great, indeed, that although I am 'in Christ,' yet for their sakes I could wish myself accursed from Christ.' Paul, observe, says all this ἐν Πνεύματι ἁγίῳ—in the *Holy Ghost*. Here, then, is an instance where Paul claims inspiration while writing what (far from forming a portion of essential religious truth) was simply a declaration of the state of his own feelings in reference to his 'kinsmen according to the flesh.'

We have thus shown that, however the promise of Christ may be explained, the Spirit did teach the Apostles something that was not essential religious truth, and that the Apostle Paul claims inspiration while uttering what formed no part of essential religious truth; the conclusion is that the Apostles were inspired as to more than what in their writings is essential religious truth; consequently, the next position which our writer maintains is of no force whatever—viz., 'that if the Apostles were inspired only in respect of religious truth, the sanction which they have given by allusion, quotation, or express testimony to the Jewish Scriptures, cannot extend the guarantee of inspiration (as far, at least, as their authority goes) to any other subject treated of in these Scriptures.' We say it is of no force, because we have removed the hypothesis on which it rested, and shown that the Apostles were, in fact, inspired in regard to more than religious truth.

But, independently of this mode of meeting this argument, we very much question the principle on which it proceeds, viz. that the declaration of one sacred writer in respect to the inspiration of another, is only to be held as authoritative to the extent of the inspiration of the writer so declaring it: so that if the inspiration

of the New Testament writers be partial, then their statements relative to the Old Testament writers, and their quotations from and references to them, are to be held as guaranteeing the inspiration of the latter only to the same partial extent as the former were themselves inspired.

This is a principle which it would be very difficult to establish, but which is assumed in the argument we have stated. We therefore require that it be proved, and the 'onus probandi' lies upon the assertor of it. But again, our author says that 'the sanction of Christ himself given to the narrative of any fact or event, does not necessarily imply original inspiration with regard to it, since historical truth alone would be implied in such a sanction.' This, however, is totally inconsistent with the principle which he had assumed in the case of the writers of the New Testament. He has laid it down as a principle, that an inspired man's sanction of another work reputedly inspired, only proves the inspiration of that work to the extent of the person's own inspiration. Now, Christ was himself universally, plenary, and verbally inspired. 'God gave not the Spirit by measure unto him.' His voice was the voice of God, as well as of man. It therefore follows, on our opponent's own principles, that when Jesus quoted the Old Testament Scriptures, he sanctioned them, as being like himself universally, verbally, and plenary inspired. This conclusion follows legitimately from the principles held by the writer; and, if he will not adopt it he must be content to lie under the reproach of inconsistency—a reproach, we may add, to which every advocate of a partial or intermittent theory of inspiration must ultimately subject himself.

The writer of the Article on which we have been commenting next proceeds to remark that 'the Apostles did not conceive themselves to be inspired as to any more than what in their writings was essential religious truth;' and he instances the introduction to Luke's Gospel as being an occasion on which, from the nature of the case, the writer, if inspired plenary, would have been led to affirm that he was so: but, instead of doing so, says our author, 'he claims to be believed because he had traced out everything accurately from the very first.' We might, however, have been informed by the writer, that the word which is there rendered 'from the very first' (*ἀνωθεν*) is one which classically, biblically, and etymologically signifies 'from above.' He might, moreover, have told us that, out of thirteen places in which it occurs in the New Testament, it is so translated in five, and in the margin of other two, and that in four other places the signification is nearly the same. And that, if so rendered in the passage in question, it would read, 'It seemed good to me also, having investigated

investigated all things *from above*.' He might, in fine, have given us to understand that such a rendering of the word is contended for by Erasmus, by Henry, and by Lightfoot. But of all these things he is himself wilfully forgetful, and chooses to keep his readers in utter ignorance. He could indeed remind them that in the case of 2 Tim. iii. 16, there was an uncertainty as to the correct rendering of it; but he prudently keeps his readers in ignorance that there is still more uncertainty as to the correct rendering of the passage on which he seeks to build up his theory.

II. We now proceed to an examination of the second part of the Article, in which the author undertakes to show that there is evidence sufficient to prove that inspiration did not extend to all parts and all subjects, but only to essential religious truth. Here we desiderate the fulfilment of a promise which he made in the beginning of his paper, 'to show the actual disproof of it (*i. e.* the commonly received theory) *in the statements of Scripture*.' Where, we ask, has he done so? He has not produced a single passage actually disproving it; but contents himself with having attempted to repel the arguments drawn from Scripture by the advocates of the theory which he opposes. There may, however, be a reason for this—and *that* the entire absence of such statements of Scripture—in as much as it is impossible for any one to find in the Bible what it does not contain; and if he cannot find a passage which teaches the partial theory of inspiration, then we say that there is a strong presumption, amounting to certainty, that *that* theory is not only unscriptural, but antiscritptural. The aim of the writer was from the first to find an 'intelligent' or rational theory of inspiration: now we submit that this aim is not only radically wrong, but irrational and absurd. The Scriptures he admits to be the only source of evidence in the case; then why not at once proceed to them, and see what they themselves teach in the matter? We must first endeavour to discover what theory is maintained in Scripture; then, *that* theory must be an intelligent one, aye, and the only intelligent one. It may be difficult for us to see its *perfect* harmony with human reason; but then which is to yield—the Bible? or our intellect? Certainly not the Bible. It is becoming but too fashionable in these days to lay down certain principles of human invention, and to try by them the statements of the word of God. The Scriptures, doubtless, address man as a reasonable being, but not in such a way as to constitute his intellect a source of appeal from their statements, or even a test by which to try them. When we go to the Bible we must find out what is therein contained; *that*, whatever it *may* be, *must* be reasonable. We are not to frame for ourselves what appears

pears to us a reasonable creed, and reject or explain away all Scripture which does not dovetail with it. To do so would just be to reverse the proper order of procedure; and to resemble the conduct of him who attempts to construct a house beginning at the roof.

I. But to proceed—we shall take up in order and briefly consider those principles, which he has laid down as obvious deductions from the nature of inspiration. He says, first, that inspiration cannot be predicated ‘where it may reasonably be affirmed that none could be necessary.’ To this principle we readily accede, if by it is meant that inspiration would not be conferred where to the mind of Jehovah a necessity for it did not appear. But if by it is meant that wherever man’s reason sees no necessity for inspiration, there none exists, then we most emphatically deny it, and that on the following grounds.

1st. We have abundantly shown that the Old Testament Scriptures, being ‘the oracles of God,’ must be held as all inspired. Now there are many things contained in the Scriptures, to narrate which does not appear to human reason to require inspiration; but then God has declared that they are all inspired, and of course he must have seen a necessity for the inspiration even of those portions of them which are (comparatively speaking) least important. History, for example, does not seem to human reason to require the inspiration of its author, but why then are the Chronicles embodied in the canon, and the books of the Maccabees placed among the Apocrypha?

2nd. Because, on such a principle, the whole Bible may be taken away piecemeal, and its inspiration frittered down to a nonentity. Different minds may see no necessity for the inspiration of different passages of Scripture. *A* may see no need of inspiration in the writing of the Law; *B*, thinking the Law inspired, may reject as unnecessary that of the Prophets; and *C*, holding by the Old Testament, may think that there is no necessity for the inspiration of the New: and thus, because each of these three parties *reasonably believes* the inspiration of each of these three parts to be unnecessary, the Bible is reduced to the level of a common composition.

3rd. Because, although all mankind were agreed upon the point, and were to affirm that there is no necessity for the inspiration of a particular part of Scripture, we maintain that even their united intellects are incapable of forming a judgment in the case. The writer seems to have anticipated such an objection, for he says, ‘We know that it will forthwith be objected that we are not competent judges where a necessity exists. Granting,’ he continues, ‘this to be true in some cases, it will not follow that it is in all,

all, unless it can be asserted that because we cannot judge in every instance, therefore we can judge in none.' The very admission, however, as it seems to us, that in some cases we are incompetent judges is sufficient to disprove the principle for which he contends; because, if liable to err in any case, then we can judge *authoritatively* and *infallibly* in none; and on a matter of such importance we demand that the decision, establishing the absence of inspiration in any case, be as *authoritative* and as *infallible* as the expression which in numberless instances declares its presence, 'Thus saith the Lord.' But then such an infallible decision can come only from one judge, and that the 'God only wise.' If in any case inspiration was actually imparted where human reason should judge it to have been unnecessary, then is human reason thrown out of court, as a witness altogether incompetent to give evidence in the case; or rather, is it degraded from the bench, as a *judge* unrighteously set up, and totally disqualified to decide on the matter. If reason cannot judge in every case, has it any right to review and criticise the conduct of the Almighty, whose oracles the whole of the Old Testament is by himself declared to be, and to say that he has imparted inspiration where there was no need for it? Who art thou, oh man, that presumest to sit in judgment on the actions of him whose wisdom is infinite, and to dictate to *him* when he should or should not impart his miraculous gift of inspiration? Who art thou that thus darest to place thy reason above that God whose gift thy reason is?*

We very much regret that he has not condescended to name any portion of Holy Writ, for the composition of which inspiration was in his opinion unnecessary. We are thus prevented from obtaining any knowledge of the class of passages which he considers uninspired; we shall not, therefore, spend time in showing that inspiration actually did exist where human *reason might* think it unnecessary, but proceed to the next general inference from the nature of inspiration which he has drawn, and maintained.

II. 'Where,' says he, 'inspiration is, there we may expect to

* On this subject, the words of Tholuck are worth quoting. 'If what we decide to be contrary to our reason falls completely within the reach of our understanding, so that it can be fully comprehended and the contrariety clearly made out, then it is impossible that a revelation can teach it. It cannot be said in a revelation that Jericho is only a day's journey, and yet a thousand miles from Jerusalem. But a revelation may contain what it is impossible for us to reconcile with our reason, and what apparently contradicts it—as, for example, the personality of man and the absoluteness of God, or the free agency of man and the agency and government of God. The understanding would decide that one or the other should be given up, yet both are facts which rest upon our own consciousness and experience. The whole difficulty is, that the subject lies beyond our reach—the understanding is not competent to its comprehension.'—Tholuck's *History of Theology in the Eighteenth Century*: Princeton Essays, First Series, p. 565.

discern

discern some indications of knowledge or wisdom superior to that possessed by people of the same age and nation.' 'Hence,' it is elsewhere added, 'all mere history, chronology, genealogy, or information of whatever kind that might be obtained through the ordinary channels of knowledge, would be without the province of inspiration.' Now with regard to this principle it is sufficient to mention the case to which we have already referred—namely, the miraculous knowledge of languages which, by the inspiration of the spirit, the Apostles and others possessed, and which they might have acquired through the ordinary channels of knowledge just as easily as they could have acquired a knowledge of history, chronology, or mere genealogy, through the same channel; but the one was imparted by inspiration, why not the others also? But we deny that inspiration *necessarily* indicates knowledge or wisdom superior to that possessed by people of the same age or nation. To instance a case of inspiration (not certainly of writers, but yet a case in point), it is an undeniable fact that the artificer who superintended the workmanship of the tabernacle was inspired; and it will not, we think, be denied by any one that there were numberless instances of workmanship in that age, in Egypt and elsewhere, in which, looking simply at the things made, an equal amount of knowledge and wisdom is evinced, and for the production of which no inspiration could be claimed.

III. 'The doctrine of inspiration,' he continues, 'involves the exclusion of error from the subject matter of inspiration, and within the sphere to which it extends.' This is a criterion which has our hearty approbation; and we say Amen to the declaration that 'where error is proved to exist, there inspiration cannot be.' But then the difficulty is to prove that error is in the word of God. Let us be pointed to chapter and verse, and we shall see if, as in the cases of astronomy and geology, the error be not in the readers, rather than in the book. And even if passages may be found in the word of God at variance with some of the doctrines of science, who shall declare, with the case of these two (to which we have just alluded) before them, that further advancement in science may not serve to establish perfect harmony between them? The Bible certainly never was intended to confer upon man a knowledge of scientific principles; but just as certainly does it contain nothing inconsistent with those principles, rightly defined and properly understood.

He says, moreover, that 'want of harmony proves error:' but then the absence of harmony must itself be proved. Now we affirm that there is no disagreement between different portions of the word of God which is not capable of being harmonised in *some* way; and, if this be the case, then, whether or not that method be the

the correct one, we are bound to believe that there yet exists a perfect consistency between them. It will not do to say that 'any candid inquirer will feel dissatisfied with the great majority of such solutions' as those which have been given by Davidson and Horne. The inquirer has no right to feel so, unless he can show ground for such dissatisfaction, either by disproving the possibility of the solution, or by himself proposing a more plausible and probable one. But we question much if a *candid* inquirer would feel such dissatisfaction. Every one has his own idea of candour, and perhaps the author may suppose that his dissatisfaction is the fruit of candour; but, for our part, we esteem that man as the most *candid* who hails such solutions with delight, as the explanations of a harmony which even previously he believed to exist, but could not discover.

He maintains also, in another part of his Article, 'that absolute truth, freedom from *liability* at any time to the entrance of error, must characterise every special communication of God.' Now, we maintain that when God has given to man a revelation of his will, it is man's duty to preserve it; and, consequently, that God's providence is not impugned in the least, although through the carelessness of man it may become corrupt. The principle involved in the remark above quoted is rather a dangerous one. Following such an opinion to its legitimate conclusion, our author would deny that man is a creature of God's at all; because, although formed perfectly pure and holy, he was yet liable to fall and to become corrupt. On this point we cannot forbear quoting his remarks:—

'Could the Divine Spirit, in the first instance, specially guide the pen of a writer, suggesting to him superhuman thoughts, and controlling him in the utterance of them, and yet suffer him to mar or dim the beauty of their truth by the admixture of aught human—that is, of error, for "to err is human" in every sense—and relatively to God in every thought and act? Or could he, having once delivered to man a sacred deposit of perfect truth, have left it unguarded to man's care, or rather carelessness—obnoxious to the mutations, and subject to the corruptions which everything placed in mortal hands must needs undergo? These two come practically to the same thing, and both are alike inconsistent with the attributes and actings of the Supreme Being. If he has suffered any particle of the truth which he designed to reveal to fail before it reached those for whom it was intended, it must have been because he wanted either the power or the will to secure its accurate enunciation or its uncorrupted transmission. But that he had the power none will deny, and that he had the will is a condition of the proposition. Moreover, for God to interpose to communicate any one truth or system of truths for the benefit of any of his creatures, and not to will the delivery thereof in its integrity to those creatures,

creatures, would be to act in vain—would be a manifest violation of the economic principle, and that not merely in his ordinary actings, but in a special supernatural intervention in which it could be infinitely less recognised.'—pp. 451, 452.

Now *one fact* is quite sufficient to overturn any abstract principle. Let us look at the fact of man's creation. He was created by the special supernatural intervention of Jehovah, 'for God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life and he became a living soul.' He came from God's hand perfect (so far, that is, as it was possible for a creature to be perfect); he was pure and spotless—holy and consequently happy. Now to this case—this fact—let us apply our author's reasoning, and we shall have something like the following. Could the Divine Being, by his special agency and influence bring into existence a perfectly pure and holy being and yet suffer this beauty to be marred by the admixture of *sin*? Or could he, having once delivered to man such a nature as a trust, leave it ungarded to man's own care (which it must be remembered would be much more efficacious in warding away error, *i. e.*, *sin*, before his fall than after it)? Such acting on our author's principles is 'inconsistent with the attributes of the Supreme Being,' and the consequence is, that here we have Jehovah acting inconsistently with himself (no wonder then that on such principles and by such writers inconsistencies should be found in his word). But still further. If man has fallen, then it was either because God had not the power or the will to keep him in his integrity. To suppose he had not the power, is to deny his omnipotence, and that he had not the will is clearly shown by the melancholy result; and therefore on the principle we are combating, God is (dare we utter it?) blameworthy for this fall and its woeful consequences. Such a manner of reasoning is evidently false, but it is quite parallel to that which is followed in the above quotation, and by which the author seeks to establish his proposition. With such an opinion, had he lived in the days of Moses, he would have denied that the first formed tables were the workmanship of God, since he could not reasonably believe that he formed them with the sole design that they should be broken by his servant, or, had he existed in the days of Eli and Samuel, he would have believed Jehovah to have been on a level with Baalim and Ashtaroth, because he permitted the ark of the covenant to be borne in triumph by the Philistines to Dagon's temple. The ark was given in trust to the Israelites, and for its guardianship they were held responsible; nay, it was a part of the *revelation* given by Moses; and it is a well known fact, that it was destroyed before the dispensation, of
which

which it formed a part, was ended.' Yet that it was so does not and cannot disprove the other fact, that it was formed by the supernatural intervention and assistance of Jehovah. So with the Bible; God has entrusted man with a revelation to which he does well to take heed, and for the preservation of which he will be held responsible; and therefore, although errors may have crept into it since it came from the hand of God, its authorship is not the less certainly his, nor is his Providence chargeable with the admission of such error. But independently of all this, what are the facts of the case? Does not every 'candid inquirer' rise from the historical and critical study of the Old and New Testaments impressed with a deeper sense than before of the force of the words, 'All flesh is grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass: the grass withereth, the flower thereof fadeth away, but the word of the Lord endureth for ever.' Generation after generation has come and gone, and yet by the Gospel 'this word is preached unto us.' God's providence has watched over it, and watched over it with anxious care; but the fact that errors, from transcription or otherwise, have crept into it is not chargeable on that Providence any more than God's providence, not man's sin, could be blamed when the condition of the Church resembled that of the allegorical vine, which the boar out of the wood wasted and the wild beast of the field devoured. Nay, has it not been with the Bible as with the Church, the period of its greatest danger has ever been the time of its most effectual protection?

IV. 'Inspiration,' he continues, 'involves adaptation to the capacities of those to whom it is addressed, and consequently where this is not the case, Inspiration cannot be predicated.' We at once accede to this, but we are at a loss to see its bearing on the present question. The Bible is adapted—wonderfully, miraculously, adapted to the capacities of all who may peruse it. Truly 'he may run that readeth it.' It is true that there are mysteries in it, but then let it be observed that what we are to believe even of them is plainly told us. The mystery is not what we are to believe, but how to explain that which is the object of our faith. Thus as regards the doctrine of the incarnation, the fact that 'God was manifested in the flesh' is plainly told us; the explanation of that fact constitutes the 'confessedly great

[†] Hence, also, an inspired book may be lost, and that too before its end may have been fully accomplished. But how can the loss of an inspired book impugn the inspiration of those which remain? We might as well deny the authorship of those books of Livy which have come down to us, because so many more of them have been lost.

mystery of godliness,' and is unrevealed. It is also a fact that many parts of revelation were unintelligible even to the writers of it: thus Daniel says, 'I heard, but I understood not;' and Peter represents the prophets as 'searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow.' With regard to this objection, a sufficient answer might be given in the words of Tholuck: ^s 'It seems to lie in the very nature of prophecy that it should be less plain than history, and it therefore cannot be expected that when God communicated the knowledge of the future, he should make it as clear as the present or the past.' But the fact that certain portions of prophecy were not understood by the prophets themselves—far from disproving—does in reality furnish evidence of the strongest kind in favour of the inspiration of their writings. Is it possible for any man, unassisted by superior agency, to write what he himself could not understand, in such a manner that it should yet be intelligible to succeeding generations? If a man writes what is unintelligible to himself, he is, in ordinary circumstances, unintelligible to every one else. But let it be borne in mind that Daniel, at the very time when he is confessing his own ignorance on the matter, affirms, 'the wise shall understand;' and that Peter, although maintaining the unintelligibility to the mind of the prophet of his own oracles, still affirms that the '*Spirit of Christ in them* testified beforehand of the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow.'

Nor ought it to be forgotten on this part of the subject, that assistance for the understanding of revelation, wherever needed, is graciously promised by its author, and consequently it seems unfair to deny inspiration to the Bible, because of its want of adaptation to the capacities of those to whom it is addressed, when the very God who has inspired it has promised to adapt the capacity to it. An important part of the office of the Spirit is the enlightening of the understanding: 'The secret of the Lord is with them that fear him, and he will show them his covenant.' 'If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God.' 'If any man lack wisdom, let him ask of God, who giveth to all men liberally and upbraideth not.'

Before concluding, we may be permitted to say something in favour of the holders of the 'superintendence' theory, to whom, in our opinion, the author of the article has not dealt strict justice. That theory, he says, is a 'manifest perversion of the term Inspiration, which is never used in any of its significations to denote or include a mere surveillance. It invariably expresses

^s *Princeton Theol. Essays, First Series, p. 569.*

a *positive action* on the subject of it, and is never comprehensive of a mere negative looking on.' But who said that superintendence is a 'mere negative looking on?' Does not the writer himself explain the term superintendence by saying (p. 447), that 'the Spirit ordinarily left the writers to themselves in the conception and enunciation of their thoughts, and interposed only when the occasion required, which might be but seldom.' Nevertheless the Spirit interposes, and is such interposition not a 'positive action?' Still further: if 'to err is human,' and if imperfection must necessarily characterise all merely human productions, would not such interposition in the case of the writers of perfect works be always required? and if always required, then, according to his own showing, it would always be given; and thus superintendence comes to mean a continuous interposition, a continuous 'positive action,' and is not therefore a perversion of the term inspiration.

We leave it to the talented author of 'Reason and Faith' to defend his views from the attacks of the writer upon whom we have been commenting, rejoicing that among its defenders the Scriptural doctrine of Inspiration can still number men of such high talents and distinguished attainments. In conclusion, we reject the doctrine of inspiration promulgated in the article alluded to, because it is not only wholly destitute of the authority of Scripture, but is expressly contradicted by it; and because, if adopted, it would tend completely to nullify the influence of a revelation, since, if every individual is to follow with implicit confidence the dictates of his own reason on the subject, then, as the wish of the heart is too frequently parent to the decision of the intellect, the conclusion of the matter would be, that each would take as inspired what suited his taste, and reject as human what jarred with his desires. From such a state of things we say, in all sincerity, 'Good Lord deliver us!' But if it be the case, as the signs of the times too surely indicate, that once again the inspiration of the Bible is to become the battle-ground of contending parties, it is surely the duty of every one who has the interests of vital Christianity at heart, to prove his armour, and see that he can use it with effect. For the ultimate issue we have no fear. As David said before Goliath, 'The Lord who delivered me out of the paw of the lion and out of the paw of the bear, he will deliver me out of the hand of this Philistine.' So let us trust that God, who has once and again rescued his own truth from the hands of its enemies, will yet stand forth its protector. The Lord of hosts is with it: the God of Jacob is its refuge.

W. M. T.

ON THE EXPLORATIONS OF THE RIVER JORDAN AND THE DEAD SEA.*

(A Lecture read before the Scientific Union of Berlin, by Dr. CARL RITTER,
Professor of Geography in the University of Berlin.)

GENTLEMEN,—At the beginning of a new period of our unpretending labours, I should hardly venture upon calling your attention away from the animated and congenial scenes that surround us, to contemplate a distant wilderness, whose very history is all but extinct, if I were not encouraged to do so by the consideration that there is no spot on earth so utterly vacant but will be found deserving, more or less, of a thinking man's examination in reference to the whole of its phenomena. The various regions of our planet, it is true, present attractions very different in degree and kind, and the great majority of amateurs will no doubt always bestow their attention and admiration chiefly on such as are either the most splendidly and luxuriantly adorned by nature, or whose history teems with a close succession of memorable events, as the tropics, or the classic ground of India, Egypt, Greece, etc.

But, as wealth and splendour have their peculiar charms, so have poverty and humility. Indeed, the distribution of the various gifts bestowed upon different countries would appear a highly unfair one if, by a just appreciation of each of those endowments, we could not discover some compensation for the seeming unfairness in point of privation. The son of the desert feels, perhaps, more at home, in the long run, amidst his monotony, than the denizen of a great capital amidst the ever-changing variety of civilized social life. Why does the Greenlander long to return to the frozen regions of the Arctic circle? Why does the Negro or Bedawin yearn to be restored to his Libyan or Arabian desert? Even to a civilized European—and we might mention a long list of illustrious names—a temporary residence in the Petræan,

* This lecture by Professor Ritter, the first geographer of his age, is undoubtedly the best dissertation upon a highly interesting subject that has yet been produced, and we have therefore much pleasure in presenting it to our readers. For the translation we are indebted to Dr. WEISSENBORN, of Weimar. Ritter's work on Palestine, referred to in his own note below, will be brought under the notice of our readers in the next number of this Journal.—ED. J. S. L.

This lecture was originally composed, not to be printed, but only to be read before an audience; still, as I was requested by different parties to publish it, it may serve as an Introduction to my Geography of the whole of Palestine, to which I beg to refer the reader as to the proofs for much of what is advanced here. I have, therefore, to appeal to the indulgence of the critics as regards many deficiencies which I had not time to remedy.—C. R.]

Arabian,

Arabian, or Syrian desert, has become a source of rich contemplation and rapture, of deep and momentous intuitions and feelings, that he would fain call up again when returned to his own country. Among the innumerable anchorites and hermits who have spent the whole of their mysterious lives in those barren and rocky wildernesses, let us only remember St. Jerome, and the world of deep and pregnant thoughts on human life, the present, the future, and all immortality, the creation of which is owing to his residence in that dreary waste.

If we wish to do justice to the productions of nature, even where she puts on her most scanty forms, we ought always to remember how far we have been benefited by them, however forbidding the aspect they may at first sight present. In the deserts of Babylonia, and those about the Euphrates, the mind of man was first elevated by astronomical observation; in those of Arabia and Mount Sinai, not only the people of Israel, but the people of Mahomet too, were first led to a notion of Monotheism. It was on the watery waste of the interminable ocean that man conceived the elements of nautical science, of scientific Cosmology, a more enlightened view of Astronomy, and the idea of the sphericity of the planet we inhabit. It may be that there are districts on the globe which are less pleasing than others, or even repulsive at first sight, but which contain certain intrinsic charms, and exercise an influence on man, magically, as it were, or unconsciously, that will become apparent only in the course of hundreds or thousands of years, in the history of the nations subject to such influence. Let us think of our own country! The peculiarities of the valley of the Jordan or those of the Dead Sea, that form the particular object of our present inquiry, do not perhaps at once justify a similar conclusion, though it will hold good with Palestine, the country of which the two above-mentioned forms of nature are constituent parts, and which has so few outward features upon the whole to commend it.

Palestine, though one of the most circumscribed and least attractive districts of our planet, is that the name of which has travelled farthest over the globe, through every country and nation, to the most distant parts of heathendom. And not only its name, but likewise what that name does essentially involve, the phenomena of the country and the part it has acted in the history of the world and of mankind, have deeply penetrated into the feelings and thoughts of the nations at large. So far as Christian communities have been established, that name is celebrated and invariably associated with the most endearing emotions of the human heart, as well as with the most important ideas and convictions. Wheresoever the light and heat of the Gospel awaken

awaken new life, thither the promised land is sure to extend, and the time shall come when the eyes of all the nations will converge towards that wonderful country teeming with the highest revelations.

Even those scattered and expelled children who had only the revelation of the law allotted to them as their portion on that soil ; those stray wanderers that are but little or not at all aware that the law has already been fulfilled, or that the world has been redeemed on that very soil, even they are riveted to it by the circle within which the ideas of their ancient faith turn ; by the era of their patriarchs ; by the God of their fathers, Jehovah ; by the one temple on Moriah ; by the illustrious period of their judges, prophets, legislators, bards, kings ; nay, by the whole destiny of their nation, its awful downfall and consequent dispersion. Even in our own days numbers of them, yearning for that ancient home of promise, are known to turn thitherwards when on the verge of death, that their remains may be gathered to those of their ancestors, at the foot of Mount Moriah.

Their oppressors too, the Arabs and Turks, the present rulers of the country, share with them the same notion about the home of their ancestor Ibrahim, or Abraham, and consider El Kuds, or Jerusalem, as being, next to Mecca, the most worthy place on earth whither to undertake a pilgrimage.

How are we to account for this attractive power working in such different directions, unless by the outward and inward nature of the very ground from which all its local events and history have sprung, like the nation itself, as from a common trunk, the fruit of which was to be matured in the right time.

This native and individual development of the several localities on our planet, which we call regions, or *habitats*, as regards organic bodies, or fatherland, where the relations of men and nations are concerned, is a source of infinite abundance and variety in creation.

Such a strictly local development of the intellectual or spiritual phenomena in the visible creation, and in the part of the globe now particularly under our consideration, is that which history points out to us in the original race of the Arameans, whose patriarchal nomadic state is altogether peculiar, and perhaps without a parallel on earth, it being a native production of the pasture-lands in Mesopotamia, on the banks of the Euphrates and Jordan, at the foot of Mounts Ararat, Hermon, and Sinai, beneath the starry sky of Assyria !

To these peculiar local phenomena there were superadded the migration of the patriarchs to the rich mountain-pastures of Canaan ; the excursions into Arabia, the temporary settlement in that fertile and civilized country, Egypt ; a stern legislation
announced

announced in thunder from Horeb and Sinai ; a tedious and destructive, though invigorating march through the Petræan desert ; then the increase of the twelve tribes in a land flowing with milk, honey, and oil, close to the barren wildernesses of Petræa, Judæa, and Ephraim ! What strange features were those ! The brook Kidron, the valley of the Jordan, the abyss in which Sodom and Gomorrah had been engulfed ; the sequestered site of Jerusalem, overtopped by the proud structures on Zion and Moriah, pouring out light like beacons upon the host of nations wandering afar ! Nor ought we to overlook the absence of safe anchorage on the sea-coast, the character of the neighbouring districts, the cedars on Mount Lebanon, the dews of Mount Hermon, the panoramic view from Mount Tabor, the rich pasture-grounds of Sharon, the flowery fields of Jezreel, the mountain scenery of Galilee, with its lakes, the very eyes of the landscape, nor the solitudes of Engaddi, or En-gedi, with their palm-trees and balsamic groves.

Who will deny that these striking natural and individual features, in no other country grouped together in the like manner, must have cast every event into their own mould, and have been reflected in tradition, history, policy, and national economy, popular opinions, and public instruction ?

If our planet does not revolve round the sun merely as an inert sphere or random aggregation of matter, but as a body organized after a regular type, which we may call the earth-type, as a living work of divine creation, whose Maker has still a hand in its development, there ought to have existed, from the very beginning of things, an intimate connection between nature and history, the native soil and the nations, physics and ethics ; a connection that we may compare with that which unites the body with the soul.

Such a connection we are, perhaps, never able to discover when under the overwhelming impressions of the actual time we live in ; but we have a better chance of observing it when looking back to the events that took place thousands of years ago, since too near a position precludes the possibility of surveying a grand object rightly, whereas at a great distance from it we can view its true proportions, provided our natural vision be aided by the eye-glass of history. And such is our commanding position, with regard to the country of which we are taking a general survey, previous to examining more closely some of its details. Palestine was from the beginning an isolated country, and was intended so to be, just as Israel was ordained to be a peculiar people ; and thus it happened that for thousands of years they both remained unintelligible as well as inaccessible to other lands and nations.

Although placed in the midst of the most concentrated masses of the old continent, in the very focus towards which the intercourse of the three parts of the world was radiating, and though closely surrounded by the most flourishing nations and commonwealths of that period—the Babylonians, Assyrians, Medians, Persians, Phoenicians, and Egyptians; the boundaries drawn by nature made it remain more isolated from them than any other nation of antiquity, that it might develop within itself a complete contrast, in vindicating monotheism against all the old world besides, and that it might mature the greatest fruit for posterity in a perfectly independent manner.

There was no great road leading through that country from one nation to another; all such communications skirted its boundaries, just as the trading-vessels did its sea-coast, where there was no safe harbour or roadstead. None of the heathen states of antiquity was connected with another through the medium of the theocracy of Jehovah, either in a geographical, commercial, political, or religious point of view; they were all separated from Canaan by the theocratical circle of ideas that became the ruling one in that country.

Within the wide compass of Syria, Palestine had a separate portion allotted to it, bounded by the isthmus of Suez and the Petrean peninsula, with Mount Sinai to the south, and extending far to the north, up to the middle plateau, or terrace-land of the Euphrates, where its torrents had broken through the defiles of the southern chain of the Taurus, falling already within the limits of Syria.

Bordered, to the west, by the waters of the Mediterranean, to the east by the sands of Arabia, and thus shut out by nature both from the Occident and Orient, Palestine in Syria became a natural link of communication between the two countries to the north and south of it (the table-land of Armenia in the Taurus, and the lowland of Egypt on the Nile); and the development of its population was of course influenced by that circumstance. Its population had originally entered it from the high lands of Asia, and had returned from civilized Egypt to their historical centre, the mountainous tract of Palestine. The above circumstance was decisive as to Palestine's relative position to the other countries, from the beginning of historical times forming, as it did, an elevated and somewhat cool isthmus, or land-bridge, bounded by a sea and desert; a prescribed road to migrate from the Euphrates to the Nile, and back again to the original and predestined home situated in the middle of the civilized districts of Western Asia, though sufficiently insulated to be safe from outward disturbance.

There was no other land on earth enjoying the same advantages
of

of situation as Palestine, the southern half of Syria. Even the northern half (the Syria of Damascus and Antioch), had not the same share of them, since the great road of communication between the nations of Babylonia, or the banks of the Euphrates, and Syria lay across it, wherefore it was soon swamped by the tide of nations setting in from the east towards the west, and again, by that which swept from the Occident to the Orient; thus losing its original population, and obtaining in its stead a mixture of various nations, languages, customs, and religions.

Does not history bear satisfactory evidence that the most northern and least insulated parts of Palestine, viz., Galilee and Samaria, were in the course of centuries sensibly affected by the vitiating influence encroaching upon them from Syria and Damascus, whereas the more southern provinces (Judæa proper) preserved their purity much longer, by reason of their more sequestered situation? The relative position of Syria, though so close to Palestine, had indeed been quite a different one as to the great events going on in Western Asia from the earliest times. It had served for the great battle-field of the three parts of the world, from the times of Hadadazer and Nebuchadnezzar, of the Achæmenides and Alexander the Great, of the Seleucidæ, Romans, Parthians, and Byzantines, down to those of the middle ages, and the wars in which the Arabs and Turks were engaged there. This tract near the mountain-passes of Syria has always been for Asia, Europe, and Egypt, either a partition or link, either a bulwark or doorway, and is to this very day the chosen ground for the solution of the great eastern question, the land where the political problems of the Orient must be decided.

In Palestine we find nothing of all this! This district of the globe, to judge from its position, would appear quite as likely to have become the scene of conflicts in the great intercourse of the nations, but it was screened from the tide of people setting in from the east.

The bulwarks and mounds of the Jordan, and the wild ravines of the Dead Sea, checked the progress even of the hordes of the wildernesses beyond them; they always made the sons of the desert, as well as those nations that used them for their allies, turn aside, and so have these stern forms of nature done upon the whole, for thousands of years.

Still Palestine, the Promised Land, had at the same time such a position between other countries and the sea, stretching its gulfs and channels into them on all sides, that, on the other hand, the roads appear to have been laid out beforehand, by which the Apostles of the Gospel were to start for every quarter of heathendom, from that centre of faith, when the moment of the fulfilment

of its mediation between the old and the new times should be come.

Do not such great features, that have through thousands of years exercised a decisive influence on the development of the destinies of nations, composed of many millions of men, distinctly point at some higher ordainment than what may be explained by mere natural forces, Plutonic or Neptunic? Do not they carry with them convincing proofs of a truly spiritual influence on the part of the world-arranging power? The agency of such a power might, I think, be shown everywhere on our planet, in the local adaptation of its organization to the great law presiding over the development of the human race; and to explain that organization of the globe we have, I believe, to look out for some higher principle than the untoward or spontaneous bursting of the ground, that an elevation may rise on one side and a depression sink down on the other; or that the continents, countries, and islands, with the arms of the sea filling their depressions or traversing them, may take such forms as chance dictates.

But leaving this view of the phenomena in connection with the whole, let us turn our attention once more to the district that forms the special object of our present inquiry.

The position which Palestine held with reference to the world at large became apparent, in its historical individuality, at an early period. Though surrounded on all sides by the capitals of the most flourishing and civilized nations, yet the country, with its temple-city, was little affected by the active operations of its neighbours; deserts and seas rendering it of difficult access in those times, and the rocks, ravines, and hills, that guarded its frontiers, proving a competent barrier against such small temptations as a district but moderately adorned by nature, and poor withal, could hold out to foreigners. Thus, by perseveringly cultivating its poor soil, which however amply remunerated the labour bestowed on it, and by always falling back on its own patriarchal centre, there being no navigable rivers leading to the sea, nor other channels encouraging external commerce, the people of Israel were enabled to complete their internal development independently, and thus to arrive at a high degree of compactness! This it was competent to perform through what nature had portioned out to it—an insulated position on the globe;—this it was destined to perform, by reason of its having kept itself undefiled by the heathen rites and idolatry of its immediate neighbours (of those tribes that were severally less powerful than the people of Israel, and that had not yet been incorporated with the great monarchies), from the time of Abraham, during 1500 years at the least, until Palestine had gone through the part it had to act

as the home of one people, until it had fulfilled its prescribed mission, exactly on that spot of our planet that was now to take its rank as the spiritual home of all the nations on earth. For when the time of the fulfilment of the law was come, and when the isolation of Palestine had been put an end to by its incorporation with the great Roman empire, the paths towards every nation, to the Occident as well as to the Orient, were at once thrown open for the Gospel; and the very dispersion of the people, hitherto the most compact of all, consequent upon the destruction of Jerusalem, was instrumental in making those paths more practicable.

This union of the most striking contrasts as to relative position on the globe,—a most secluded retirement, along with the facilities for a most universal communication with every one of those nations that were foremost in civilization in ancient times (through the medium of trade and languages, by sea and land), with the Arabian, Indian, Egyptian, Syrian, and Armenian, as well as with the Greek and Roman elements of civilization;—in the common central space of all these territories, yet not affected by them;—in their common historical focus, yet not kindled by their beams; this union is what constitutes the characteristic individuality of the Promised Land, destined from the beginning to be the home of the chosen people.

The old time, however, is gone by, and the new one leads us back to the same spot of our planet only by virtue of a spiritual regeneration. The nations, languages, and old religious ideas, are all but extinct there; the wheel of the history of the world is rolling towards a different quarter. This same land is to day governed and animated by strangers, its entrances lie open in almost every direction; the spirit of the age has struck root even there; nothing except the one rigid, stationary, perplexing form of nature, the tract of the Jordan and the Dead Sea, has stood its ground to this day; for even the Arabian desert, stretching beyond that district towards the east, has in consequence of the annual Hadj, or great caravan of pilgrims, proceeding from Damascus to Akaba Aila, on the south-eastern extremity of the Dead Sea, and from thence to Mecca and Medina, become a regular thoroughfare for various nations, though the same desert district had been traversed only once within the few thousand years before Mahomet's time, in the opposite direction, from south to north, when the people of Israel proceeded to Canaan from Mount Sinai.

But that hydrographic tract, that extensive crevice in the crust of the earth, unique in its kind, on account of its bottom-line being at the lowest absolute level, and stretching from Mount Lebanon southward, between high hills and bare grey cliffs, as between walls cut

cut deeper in proportion as the waters of the Jordan descend in their course towards the Dead Sea, is still the same as it was before. It continues to form a partition between the nations; and that natural coil of obstacles, almost insurmountable, has at all times effectually withstood any attempt at opening a regular communication and intercourse between the nations dwelling to the east and west, or to the south and north! For even the temporary resuscitations of the old times of Solomon and the Pharaohs, through Mahomet and the Crusaders, have proved but transitory phenomena, and being forced, as it were, upon their originators, have never had a chance of becoming established.

But the movement of the spirit of the modern time is beginning to encroach on this scene; and we may trace its interesting agency amidst these singular forms and phenomena of plastic nature, in these most forbidding localities of the crust of our planet, that hitherto had almost escaped observation. The element of history is, at this very juncture, actually closing with that most refractory stronghold of rigid nature. Not one scientific traveller of Europe had seen the sources of the Jordan up to the first years of our nineteenth century! The history of its course was both defective and fabulous. Since the time of the Romans there was only the expansion of that river, forming the lovely Lake of Galilee, which was known somewhat more precisely (though not at all completely), because a more practicable road had led by its western bank to Tiberias; whereas the whole eastern side of it had remained, almost to the present day, an inaccessible fabulous territory. But who would have ventured in a common boat upon the navigation of a lake so boisterous as this was reputed to be? This, nevertheless, has been repeatedly done within these few last years. Then, to follow the outlet of the lake and the subsequent course and development of the mysterious Jordan through its long valley, formidable on a hundred accounts, down to its mouth in the lake of Asphaltos, had, *à fortiori*, never been attempted by mortal European. Touched upon here and there, that valley of the Jordan had always repelled its visitors, who shrunk back from it, after having experienced violence of all kinds; often, at the imminent risk of their lives from excess of fatigue, heat, want of food and drink, or from the rapacity, ferocity, or feuds, of its later or present wandering tenants, whose feuds are interminable, as they are kindled anew by every murder committed on friends or relations. Up to the last few years there are but two instances on record of Europeans having succeeded in going through the whole valley of the Jordan, from one of the said lakes to the other, viz., that of St. Wilibald, first bishop of Aichstädt,

Aichstädt, who did so as a pilgrim, in the seventh century of our era ; and that of Baldwin I., one of the Christian kings of Jerusalem, who performed the same journey, accompanied by a small body of knights, during the period of the Crusades.

It is true that many thousands of the Christian inhabitants of the Occident had, year after year, visited the southern extremity of this extensive *terra incognita* by repairing to Jericho and the bathing-place in the Jordan ; but these pilgrims had invariably set out from Jerusalem, situated sideways, only at the distance of seven leagues,—a trembling band escorted by Turks. They had regularly returned by the same route, and but few among them had had the courage to penetrate a few leagues farther to the mouth of the Jordan, that they might boast of having witnessed the terrors of the Dead Sea, or of having been buoyed up by its bitter and salt rippling waves, when bathing in it.

There was not known any settlement of peaceable men, either in the valley of the Jordan or on the wild rocky beach of the Dead Sea. There was, as far as we knew, no arable ground or garden-cultivation ; no cool fresh-water spring or tributary stream ; no shady tree against the withering glare of the sun ; no fish enlivening the brine of the lake, or affording means of subsistence to its visitors ;—nay, it was reported that birds traversing the atmosphere of the asphaltic lake, tainted with sulphurous vapour, were stunned and ingulfed. Thoughts of nothing but death hovered round that dread sea which had closed over Sodom and Gomorrah. The almost impracticable ravines radiating from it were looked upon as mere dens of robbers and assassins : frightful forms of nature and horrid inhuman deeds united here to create in the fertile imagination of the Orientals, through a long succession of centuries, an enchanted ground, fraught with myths and fables, though there was nobody to report on it from his own observation. The lines of the river and lake were laid down on numberless maps notwithstanding, and with a peremptory boldness, implying that there did not exist the least doubt about them ; but in fact the latter part of the course, as well as the source of the Jordan, had remained shut out from the sight of civilized man for some thousands of years. Where the drainings of the Dead Sea might find an outlet, whether subterraneously to the west and the Mediterranean, as was held by Eratosthenes and other ancient writers, or towards the south and the Red Sea ;—whether that outlet had been above ground before, and only dammed up, or whether it had been dried up, in consequence of the waters having gradually subsided ;—these obvious questions and hypotheses, and many more, used to be discussed and answered with a forwardness suited to the absolute ignorance prevailing about the leading facts.

And

And how could these facts have been known, the localities to which they relate having remained a true *terra incognita* till within these last fifty years?

For even as late as 1806, when our countryman, Ulrich Jasper Seetzen, the first adventurous traveller that had the good fortune of discovering once more the true sources of the Jordan, as well as the eastern districts of its valley, and the whole eastern coast-line of the Dead Sea, had succeeded in penetrating towards the southern end of that great lake into the salt valley of Zoar, and in reaching the famous boundary of the Brook of the Willows, or Sared, (once forded by Moses with the children of Israel, when proceeding from Mount Sinai, near the Red, to the Dead Sea, and there setting his foot first on Moab ground,) this being the farthest point to the south that he was able to visit. Even so late as that, the immediate neighbourhood of the southern extremity of the Dead Sea remained utterly unknown for a few years longer, until his equally bold successor, Ludwig Burckhardt of Basel, withdrew, in 1812, the veil from the whole of the districts of Edom and Sinai, exhibiting them to our view in some degree of clearness and transparency.

But to what influence could the whole of the hydrographic system of the Jordan have been subjected, within the short period of a quarter of a century, after the lapse of hundreds, nay, thousands of years, whereby a change in the relations and phenomena might be prepared, so as to usher in a new time, even in that Orient so stationary in other respects?

Were it only an indication or show of progress that will probably be followed, though slowly, by larger strides, even in that case it would certainly deserve our attention on so stubborn a ground! The true sources of the Jordan, in the system of the Anti-Lebanon, as well as those sources near snowy Hermon, which were from times of yore held to be the true ones, and the object of a veneration almost idolatrous, have been more closely investigated, in a geographical, astronomical, and antiquarian point of view; and so have been many other localities, monuments, and circumstances subservient to a better insight into many of the events of the highest antiquity, especially localities mentioned in the Old and New Testaments (such as Banias, Cæsarea Philippi, Dan, Lais, Capernaum, etc.), by Seetzen (1805), Burckhardt (1812), and many later excellent observers, who have even regularly surveyed a number of these sites.

The neighbourhood and different relations of the charming alpine Lake of Tiberias, with its black basaltic hills, its numerous hot springs and other volcanic phenomena, as well as its architectural remains, and all such sites about it as are important for the

the history of the New Testament, have likewise been so thoroughly investigated, that a new gladdening light has been shed on all Galilee, as well upon its sacred as its profane history, whereby we may obtain a much clearer conception of the period when the great events took place there, than we could possibly arrive at before.

The hydrographic districts of the headstreams of the Jordan, down to the lovely alpine Lake of Tiberias, having been already exhibited by others, we shall not enlarge upon them here. When, in the time of the Romans, the disciples of Jesus, the same who as Apostles won whole nations afterwards, cast their nets for fish in that Sea of Galilee, it was still ploughed by vessels with sails, though since that period it is become utterly desolate. Only within these last few years, boats with sails and foreign flags, surveying its coasts, and sounding its unknown depths, have again met the eye of the wondering natives upon its blue waters. This will probably lead, at no distant time, to a friendly intercourse between the inhabitants of the opposite coasts, who have been constantly engaged in feuds with each other hitherto; and the fishery may become as flourishing again as it was in ancient times.

Those boats, it is true, were brought there from England and North America; but they will serve to the natives as patterns for imitation. The same sea-faring nations have, through the power of their governments, attempted the arduous undertaking of fitting out naval expeditions for the express purpose of exploring the Jordan and the Dead Sea, that an end might be put to this disgraceful ignorance, in which the civilized European nations who live much nearer those parts, continued to acquiesce with reference to them. But the difficulties to be overcome in performing that task could not all of them be anticipated, and what degree of energy was required to carry it out, may be judged from the circumstance, that the opposing obstacles could only be conquered by three successive attempts.

The first object of the British Board of Ordnance was a triangulation and a determining of the levels of the Lake of Tiberias, and of the course of the Jordan, down to the Dead Sea, as well as to have soundings taken of the different depths of the latter. This task was partially performed in 1841 by Lieutenant Symonds, R.N.; and thus at least a foundation was laid towards a positive knowledge of a district that had hitherto been mapped out chiefly from materials furnished by hypotheses and imagination.

The next step was taken six years after, in 1847, when it was attempted to undertake the actual navigation of a river whose nature was as yet altogether unknown, its beginning and end having only been seen. The instructions which Lieutenant Molyneux, the

the commander of the second expedition, held from the British Navy Board, were, that he should run down the Jordan from the Lake of Tiberias to the Dead Sea. This first trial did but partially succeed. During eight days, and within the short distance of scarcely thirty leagues, he had most severely to struggle, both against the rocky and intractable river, abounding in shoals and rapids, and the vagrant Bedawins haunting its banks. From both of these dangers he had a narrow escape to the oasis of Jericho, the only place affording some protection near the wilderness of the Jordan; and he had to effect his retreat by night, when his boat had been taken by a gang of robbers, after having been all but wrecked on the numberless rocks in the cataracts. Though the party had been constantly in arms, to keep the host of the Bedawins in awe, or to meet the attacks that threatened them on all sides, yet the camp and boat were surprised and ransacked at last, and the greater number of those brave navigators were stripped of everything and driven into the desert in all directions.

Still, the course of the river, and the nature of the greater portion of its valley had become known! Its many curious windings, and both the facilities and difficulties it presents throughout a considerable part of its extent, had been observed, and such knowledge was to turn to the benefit of future undertakings. Lieutenant Molyneux's presence of mind and courage were a match for his misfortune, and for carrying him through the whole of his severe task. After the failure he had experienced, it took him but few days to collect fresh forces at Jericho, with the assistance of the means afforded by Jerusalem, so near at hand:—the boat was recovered, and fitted out anew. As early as the 3rd of September, 1847, he embarked once more, and after a few hours he entered the Dead Sea, the goal of his mission, in company with only two men, possessing no nautical knowledge at all,—the only members of the expedition who remained to him.

A violent gale at once swept his little craft, manned with so incompetent a crew, over the frothy waves of the salt sea into its middle, and on towards its south end; and after having been tossed about for two dreadful days on that sullen element, without any protection from the withering heat of the sun, and without deriving any great advantage from pulling the oars, they at length succeeded in regaining the northern shore, from whence they had set out, though in such an exhausted state that Lieutenant Molyneux died a few days after, from the excess of fatigue he had undergone.

The few notes on the localities explored contained in his journal served, however, to give a deeper insight into the dangers attending similar expeditions, as well as into the means by which these dangers

dangers might be either overcome or avoided. There could be no doubt but that the season (the month of August) which had been chosen for the navigation of the Jordan, was a wrong one, the water being too low at that time, and considerably less than had been anticipated. The party had been obliged to carry the boat over shoals, rocks, and cataracts, for distances as great as those through which it could be made to float in water sufficiently deep; and as for the Dead Sea, the violence of the briny swell, as well as the power of the gales in raising the billows of the salt and bitter water, had been underrated.

Within a year after (1848), the third attempt was made on that stubborn lake-field, and this time the victory over those powers of nature and their perils was a complete one. The honour of that victory was, however, wrested from the old world by the new. The United States of North America sent from the other side of the Atlantic a vessel fitted out for the purpose. It was well provided with stores and instruments, and had a competent crew, under the command and scientific direction of two officers, Lieutenants Lynch and Dale. To be prepared for every sort of danger, it had on board two metallic boats, one of iron, the other of copper, which, being made in sections for transportation, were carried or drawn on trucks by camels from the seaport of Acre to the Lake of Tiberias. From thence the expedition of discovery was to proceed again by water, through the deepest and hottest crevice of the earth; and, truly, to go through that undertaking under a tropical sky, there was required as much circumspection as for those expeditions which were about the same time completed or begun, respectively, by the Britons in the antarctic and arctic regions, amidst the icefields of the two poles. Man feels an inward impulse to break through the limits that nature draws round him in every direction; because complete truth and liberty of mind can only become his portion, in so far as he is able to attain to the fulness of knowledge.

Previous to this American expedition to the Dead Sea (in 1848), many a traveller by land had, as is well known, collected fragmentary information on the banks of that curious lake. During a long succession of centuries, numberless pilgrims had contented themselves with catching a bewildering glimpse of it, from its western cliffs, and with the awful legend of its origin. Fables and exaggerations of their heated imagination they would carry home with them to Europe, about the bitter and salt waters that would buoy up any substance, though Sodom and Gomorrah, whose ruins, it was asserted, were still visible below, had been engulfed in them;—about the sulphurous pool on which masses of asphaltos (Jew's pitch, as they call it), from which the lake
took

took one of its ancient names, as big as houses, were floating ;—about the pestilential vapours which it exhaled, thereby killing anything that has life in it ;—about the clouds of smoke rising from it and darkening the air, and about many things besides ; but there was an utter want of positive facts or of a critical observation, with the exception of an occasional flask filled with water from the Dead Sea, to be analyzed at home.

A great change in the state of the question had, however, taken place since Seetzen had, in 1805 and 1806, made the districts of Palestine the object of his inquiry, in his capacity as a natural philosopher, whereas hitherto they had only been examined in a theological and antiquarian point of view. Arrived at the mouth of the Jordan, he formed the bold plan of performing what had never been attempted before, viz. of proceeding along the whole eastern margin of that extensive basin, the very outline of which in that quarter was then unknown, to its southern extremity. This he could effect only under the protection of several independent chieftains of the Bedawin robbers, who had shared bread and salt with him in their tents, and whose bounden duty, according to their laws of hospitality, it had thus become to defend him against any enemy that might assail him. But being likewise tied down by the obligation of revenging any murders committed on their friends or relations, they were all of them engaged in feuds with the neighbouring tribes. Thus the danger was but lessened, not removed ; and he often had to exchange guides in the wilderness, from rock to rock, from tribe to tribe. The intrepid philosopher could only gain his point by walking on foot, in a tattered garb, with the beggar's staff in his hand, without any money or other valuable thing about him, often carrying on his shoulder a bag or skin filled with flour or water (there being in many parts no supply of fresh water), as his sole means of subsistence, and having nobody to assist him but his guide who would, between whiles, beguile the lingering hours or the fatigue, by cheerily chaunting his Arabian epic songs. But such was his zeal that the fatigues, dangers, and distress he had encountered on his first excursion over the hills, at some distance from the eastern shore of the Dead Sea, from Heshbon to Kerak, in March, 1806, could not prevent him from wandering once more along the whole eastern coast of the same lake, from north to south, and back again, in the months of January and February, 1807. This time he kept as close as possible to the shore, so as to have constantly a view of the lake from the high and wild rocky path he was treading.

Those rugged cliffs, often dipping into the lake in a perpendicular line, with their numberless chasms, cones, and disjected masses, whose sequestered solitude for thousands of years, had
not

not been relieved by the visit of man, and whose only tenant had been the bounding Capricorn or a large species of wild goat, herds of which were often dislodged by Seetzen from narrow and high grassy spots;—that intricate maze of tawny walls of sandstone, containing oxide of iron, and of basaltic columns towering on high, often appeared to preclude any possibility of progress, whilst sideways the eye was met by some dreadful abyss plunging into the lake, and before, by some narrow ravine with a roaring torrent, such as the brook Arnon, the old famed boundary of the Moabites and Ammonites.

Descending, here and there, to the mouths of these eastern coast-rivulets, that to the picturesque vaulted gate, for instance, through which the Arnon enters the lake, he would refresh his parched palate with their waters, or take a cool bath to raise his drooping spirits against more fatigue. Fresh-water fish, seasoned with the salt of the lake, was his food; the branches of the Cypress his couch, and a sheepskin his covering; still he dared not, during the cold nights of January, warm himself with a good fire, lest he should allure thereby such robbers as might lie concealed in some ambush or cave in the rocks. For though along the whole eastern shore there was no settlement, nor even hut, to be seen; yet at the distance of a few days' journey towards the east, there exist the ruins of many hundred places that flourished centuries or thousands of years ago, the architectural remains—fortifications, arched bridges, walled cisterns, etc.—of which some are often on the most extensive scale, ruins that are surrounded with fertile pasture-lands, terraced vineyards, or other cultivation; and these are tenanted by tribes of Arab herdsmen who, as Bedawins, or sons of the desert, are always ready to act the part of robbers, and sometimes extend their hunting or foraging excursions to the very shore of the lake. On that ground, covered with ruins, Seetzen had, a year before, reaped a rich harvest of discovery for the history of the Old Testament; for he had been the first to find there again the ancient residences of the kings of the time of Moses, the ruins of the palace at Ar Moab of the Moabites, as well as those of the palace at Heshbon, where the two marble basins which Solomon likened to the eyes of the landscape (Song vii. 4), still characterize it as the former residence of the King of the Amorites. It was he, who in the country of King Og of Bashan, that most powerful of the contemporary rulers to the east of the Jordan, discovered the ruins of many of the threescore cities, fenced with high walls, gates, and bars, described in Deuteronomy (iii. 4, 5). The gates and entrances of the strongholds, grottoes, and stone houses, were to this day shut with unwieldy solid stone doors, which turned on hinges cut

cut out of the same rock. Thus the first step was made to obtain a full understanding of the historical records of those ancient times, as well as a more profound appreciation of the awful prophecies we find in so many chapters of Isaiah with reference to these extensive districts and their inhabitants.

In the course of this second excursion close to the shore, Seetzen did not fall in with a single human being, but continued for weeks in the most dreary wilderness, whose only inhabitants were goats, porcupines, and other wild animals, among which there was in particular a great number of the small marmot-like rock-badger (*Hyrax Syriacus*), haunting the most rugged crevices and the most inaccessible caves;—the animal is called in Hebrew *Shaphan*, of which the Psalmist says (civ. 18): ‘the high hills are a refuge for the wild goats, and the rocks for the *conies* ;’ Luther and other translators have named it so, having mistaken it for a rabbit. It is the *Wubber* of the modern Arabs, here as well as on Mount Sinai, and the rocks about the Kidron, and which Solomon, in his Proverbs (xxx. 24-28), enumerates among ‘the four things that are little upon the earth, but exceeding wise,’ the ants, the conies (*shaphan*), the locusts, and the spiders, and of which we are told (xxx. 26): ‘the conies are but a feeble folk, yet make they their houses in the rocks ;’ a statement which Seetzen found fully borne out. Still, in a few sequestered and protected localities, especially near the mouths of several clear fresh-water streams, where small alluvial plains or deltas had been formed by rich mud and detritus flooded down from the mountain district during the lapse of thousands of years, he met with more congenial spots, within small bays with green islets, which at some distant period may have been inhabited by peaceable settlers. They were uncultivated, it is true, but amidst the rocky wilderness about the salt-lake they gave the impression of green blooming oases. Besides the variegated sedges and the thickets of oleander, decked out with purple blossoms and laurel-like leaves, which adorned the banks of every brook, there were indications of former garden, or other cultivation, in the pomegranate, fig, and almond trees now returned to a wild state ; and the numerous groups of date-palms, rising high above the rest of the vegetation, with their graceful crowns of pinnated leaves, may be considered as a positive proof that these spots were once cultivated, since palms of that species do nowhere exist in the East as native wild plants, but wheresoever they are found they are either planted or have returned to the wild state. This social companion of man in the tropics has shared the same fate among trees, as the social domestic and pasture animals have done among the animal race in their accompanying man in all his migrations, and to all his settle-
ments

ments round the globe, namely, that they are no longer found existing in any spot in a genuine state, their original habitat being altogether unknown. So it is with the date-tree, that queen of the grasses, as the Hindoos call it, but which bears no fruit here, by the Dead Sea, because there is no longer the fostering hand of man, that transplanted it there, to draw, in this barren wilderness, some support from its nutritious clusters, which even to-day bestow food upon millions, in the palm-groves of other districts.

There is no knowing what people transplanted this noble cultivated tree into these oasis-like solitudes, near the banks of the Dead Sea. Those must have been happier times than any within the last two thousand years, or even our own. The date-trees we behold now, may possibly be the wild offspring of those planted in the ancient time of David and Solomon, for the palm-groves, vineyards, and balm-gardens of Engaddi (En-ge-di), lying opposite, on the western bank of the lake, were planted by those two royal proprietors, though there is scarcely a trace of them now left, nor of those much older ones of Jericho, celebrated as the City of Palms as early as the time of Moses! Here, on the eastern shore, however, a more perfect seclusion from the destructive movement of the nations to which the northern and western coasts of the Dead Sea have been exposed, may have allowed the vigorous growth of the palm-trees to go on without interruption, for the palm, even when its stem is quite decayed, will, in consequence of its innate vital energy, continually push forth fresh shoots from its roots, and rise again, Phoenix-like; an unperishableness, for which it has probably been called *Phoenix* at some early period.

To this surprising phenomenon was added another, observed by Seetzen about the north-eastern corner of the Dead Sea namely, convincing proof that volcanic action on a large scale, had taken place there, at some distant time, the secondary phenomena being still in operation. He did not, indeed, discover the Tur el Hommar, or Mountain of Asphaltum, which he had been assured by the legend-tellers of Hebron rises there, pouring out naphtha that runs down into the asphaltic lake, and, being cooled therein, becomes asphaltum; neither was there any volcano to be seen, as had been formerly imagined; but the coast had undergone such disruption, there was such a profusion of precipices and of conglomerates which had been melted by fire, as well as of blocks thrown in all directions, and, for half a day's march, the whole line of the coast was a district so crowded with boiling springs and scalding-hot streams, of which there were half-a-dozen, filling the whole atmosphere with steam and vapour,

vapour, and which had deposited a formation of travertine that had gone on for thousands of years, building and again demolishing bridges over the brooks, and in many places covering the earthy strata with a thick layer—that there could be no doubt as to an extensive source of heat still existing under ground.

At the northern extremity of this pseudo-volcanic district, a roaring mountain-torrent, called Wadi Zerka Ma'in, pours out its waters into the salt lake. On account of the hot springs that speedily mix with its waters, this has been thought the most likely site of Callirrhoe of the ancients, so famous for Herod's having tried, though in vain, to recover in its hot vapour-baths from the dreadful disease to which he fell a victim.

This latter spot has been visited by a few more travellers after Seetzen, though not one among them has been daring enough to repeat his excursion along the eastern coast. The information given here about his discoveries, as well as the outline of the eastern coast of the Dead Sea, are taken from his unpublished journals which have been preserved, though that bold traveller himself had the misfortune to be murdered by some unknown hand, while further engaged in exploring Southern Arabia.

Crossing the Dead Sea to its western coast, we find there rocks and wildness less bold, though still awful in its rugged forms. On account of the neighbourhood of the more cultivated district of Jericho, as well as of the mountain-cities or towns of Jerusalem, Bethlehem, and Hebron, only at the distance of a long day's march, it has at all times been more accessible, and some of its parts better known, particularly as regards Masada, Engaddi, and Mar Saba.

The top of Mount Sebbeh which rises precipitously from the lake, on its south-western side, to the height of one thousand feet, had nevertheless not been visited before 1842, when Wolcott, an American, ascended it to examine the ruins of the ancient fortress of Masada, built by King Herod on its lonely rocky brow, in the midst of the wilderness, to be garrisoned by ten thousand men. There, as we are told by Josephus, the horrible concluding scene of the tragedy of Palestine was acted; about a thousand Hebrews who had survived the destruction of Jerusalem are said to have fled thither with their families, in hopes it would prove a safe asylum, but after having been besieged for months by the legions of Flavius Silva, the general of the Romans, they, in order to escape from perishing in the flames, surrounding them already on all sides, or from a disgraceful captivity, resorted to the desperate and horrid resource of mutual self-destruction, casting lots for the purpose, and slaughtering one another to the last man, who killed himself with his own sword!

Even

Even the rocky cliffs of Engaddi, towering over the same side of the lake, though more to the north, and so famous for their vineyards and palm-groves in Solomon's time, were only first visited in 1838 by the Americans, Eli Smith and Robinson, who found nothing of the old magnificence left, except the gushing spring of fresh water, about the middle of the height of the rock, its immediate neighbourhood being still, as it was thousands of years ago, transformed into a little Paradise, though enlivened only by the song of birds, among which there was the nightingale, which has perhaps this single habitat throughout the whole wilderness. For wherever the eye may turn, it descries nothing but desolate rocks and chasms. About the entrances of the numerous caves in the steep light-yellow limestone cliffs, now become inaccessible, the flights of stairs that once led to them having crumbled down long ago, an observer, standing below, may yet perceive here and there, thresholds, doorposts, or small window-jambes of marble. There the leading men of the people used once to rest themselves from their toils; there we have entered the wilderness of Engaddi, whither Saul repaired with his three thousand armed men, 'to seek David and his men upon the rocks of the wild goats;' there he came to the cave by the sheep-cotes, and went in to cover his feet, whereupon David only cut off the skirt of the robe of his sleeping adversary, without daring to stretch forth his hand against the anointed of the Lord.

Here, in the neighbouring stronghold of Ziph, it was where the most noble covenant of friendship was made before Jehovah between the faithful Jonathan and the heroic David, who was then driven to the last extremity (1 Sam. xxiii. 18); a covenant that will for ever ennoble this wilderness; an extremity whose full extent we can only conceive from the prayers for help and salvation that we find in the Psalms of the Royal bard.

The north-western corner of the Dead Sea, near the mouth of Brook Kidron, in the valley of the Monks, or Wadi-el-Rhâhib, where, during the first centuries of the Christian era, many thousands of hermits led their contemplative lives, as still testified by the innumerable grottoes wrought out in the rocks of that sullen locality, and now haunted only by foxes, jackals, owls, and flocks of wild pigeons; that corner, too, has preserved its peculiar reminiscences. The safest way for securing salvation was then thought to consist in an entire abnegation of this world, and in mortifying the flesh in that most dreary rocky wilderness; and the monastery of Mar Saba, built under such a false religious impression in the 4th century, overhanging, like a swallow's nest, a rocky precipice 800 feet high, and flanked by walls and towers,

like a regular fortress, as a protection against those brown ravens of the desert, the Bedawin robbers, whose attacks have been incessant ever since, has stood its ground to this day.

When, in those early centuries, an army of ten or twenty thousand anchorites peopled these wildernesses, forming *Lauræ*, or communities, each under the direction of some master or prototype of sanctity, from whom soon after sprung up the monasteries, ruins of which may be still seen in many a waste, *Sanctus Saba* was one of the most conspicuous among those masters. His fame at that time filled the world, from the imperial court of Byzantium to Alexandria and the river Nile, and throughout the East to the river Euphrates; for he was the great hero of the church in a hermit's garb, who opposed the sceptre of emperors and kings, or the drawn swords of generals, with the cross and the commandments of the church, in defence of the latter. After having withdrawn three several times from the vulgar host of the *Lauræ*, removing from one wilderness to the other, he at length, to escape for ever from their turmoil, built the monastery named after him, where he passed his old age in tranquillity, and which still preserves, in its churches and chapels, manuscripts on parchment and various treasures, which have but lately been examined by learned travellers.

Having thus returned again to within a short distance from the place where the Jordan enters the Dead Sea, there only remains for us to state briefly the results of the latest navigation of each, in April and May, 1848, whereby we shall obtain a clearer insight into the peculiarities of these two forms of nature.

The Jordan is far from being, like other rivers, the quickening artery of the country through which it flows; it has neither become the first mover of the operations of the people dwelling near it, nor does it, like our European rivers, dispense blessings in being the great line of settlement, commerce and civilization. Here everything was to be different! Nevertheless, the low level of the valley of the Jordan constitutes the great feature in the physiognomy of the land, giving the country of Palestine quite a character of its own. For this Jordan is a river like no other upon earth; it is unique in its kind. An inland river, having no mouth towards the sea, absorbed in the deepest chasm of the old world, at a great depth below the level of the ocean, accompanying the longitudinal line of the Syrian mountain tract, nay, running perfectly parallel with the neighbouring coast of the Mediterranean, bending nowhere towards it, as all other rivers do towards the respective seas; whereas the Orontes, running in an opposite direction to the north, has broke through the Syrian mountain chains towards the Mediterranean, near Antioch. Without
having

having turned towards that sea through the shortest transversal valley, at its southern extremity, it suddenly disappears, leaving the continuation of its longitudinal valley towards the Red Sea to lie dry. Issuing from the tops and caves of Mount Lebanon, it forms three lakes of different dimensions on the terraced steps of its valley that have been but partially drained, viz. Lake Meron, the Lake of Galilee, and the Dead Sea!

Thus its mixed hydrographic system has remained stationary at a low stage of development towards the condition of a river that dispenses blessings of all kinds. Its valley not having completed a formation adapted for profitable settlement, and being but a singular temporary crevice between rocky cliffs and receding slopes, through which its waters alternately rush impetuously, and become stagnant, it has not arrived at the continuous, equable, regular course of our European rivers.

Thence the absence of its navigation in former days; thence the difficulties experienced in navigating it of late! It took ten days of the greatest exertion to go through the short distance from the Lake of Tiberias to the Dead Sea, even when the waters of the Jordan were at a high level. Of the three river boats, the one built of wood, was, on the very first day, smashed between the rocks in the cataracts. The iron and copper boats, though severely tried, went safe through all perils. The river, the general course of which lies north and south, has such numberless windings and turns, that they had often to steer sideways or even backwards, and that it was found impossible to survey every detail. On the original map, which has been laid out with the greatest care, we count at least 150 more or less considerable windings. These are marked, in the upper course of the river, by as many rocky bars or shelves with raging and foaming cataracts of different heights and lengths, being either true waterfalls down which the boats had to shoot, or even more dangerous rapids, where there was imminent risk of being wrecked on the shelves or whirled and smashed against the rocky banks. Within the lower portion of the river's course there was a repetition of the same perils, but the obstacles from boulders and sandbanks, or other shallows and stagnations, retarding the progress of the boats, were more frequent. The banks of limestone that were only clothed with sedges, grass, or thorny shrubs, had presented little hindrance or danger; thus, in the lower section of the valley of the Jordan there was much of both from the thickets of trees fringing the banks, for in the upper part not only the rigging of the boats would become entangled in the branches, stretching far across the river, when the crews tried to escape in the shade from the withering heat of the sun to which they

they were exposed in the middle of the river, but likewise because hyenas, leopards, and other beasts of prey, were crowding towards the river to quench their thirst, and might be lurking in the narrow paths of the wood and jungle, ready to fall upon such of the party as set their foot on the banks.

But they were also obliged to keep their guns constantly loaded in case of any attack from the Bedawins, for there were a dozen of independent tribes engaged in feuds or struggles for superiority, or defending the boundaries of their respective territories, and threatening to surprise the party at every moment. Any carelessness on the part of those in the boats, or of the caravan proceeding by land, would have been productive of massacre and pillage. To the above various difficulties, which gave rise to a hundred adventures, and to overcome which the men had rather oftener to wade in the water, in order to keep the boats afloat, than to sit in them on water or dry land, there were added the frequent divisions of the river into arms, between rocks and islets, where there was always a doubt which of the channels was the most promising. We may therefore imagine what was the delight of Lieutenant Lynch, the commander of the expedition, on arriving, on the 17th of April, with his whole party safe, at the famous bathing-place of the Jordan, with Jericho and the mouth of the river in the Dead Sea close by, from whence he wrote a short despatch to the Navy Department of Washington, about the interesting results he had already gained, couched in these terms:—

‘ We have, within ten days, sailed through a distance of the river measuring 30 leagues; it is in the last stage of its swelling; a few days later the navigation would have been impossible. We have, in our metallic boats, safely shot down twenty-seven great and dangerous cataracts, and three times as many smaller ones. The Jordan has many more windings in its course than the Mississippi. All is well and promising!’

Now there still remained the performance of the second task of the expedition, viz. the navigation and survey of the Dead Sea.

Here other fatigues and difficulties presented themselves. The two metallic boats entered the lake accompanied by a nauseating sulphurous smell. A fresh north-wester soon veered round into a violent inhospitable gale from the south, lashing the waves up into foam, the spray covering the clothes of the men with a stiff crust of salt, and making their skin and eyes smart and itch excessively. The dreadful tempest threatened either to smash the boats by the heavy billows, striking against the trembling metallic walls like hammers of Titans, or to swamp them with brine. The officers of the expedition felt as if they had entered the Dead Sea by a forbidden gate, and as if grim satellites were commanding them,

them, through the roar of the tempest, to stand aloof from the entrance to the everlasting grave of the dead. The danger, however, passed over, the gale subsided, and they were carried over to the western coast, to the mouth of the Brook Kidron, below the cliff called Feshchah, where they were joined, soon after, by the land caravan that had gone a little astray, and where they enjoyed the mutual satisfaction of meeting all safe. The tempest was followed by a calm moonlight night, when they were surprised at hearing the convent-bell of Mar Saba ringing the hour of midnight through the solitude of the valley of the Kidron, a most relieving sound, informing them that they were united to human beings by Christian prayer, even here by the Dead Sea, and in the most dreary wilderness.

Twenty days were spent in the navigation of the Salt-lake and of its whole coast, from headland to headland, and the encampments were changed from one place to the other, however few the temptations held out by some of the localities, where the most indispensable supply of water could perhaps only be procured from a brackish or lukewarm spring. It was natural that they should have chosen for their principal encampment, as they did, a spot situated at the foot of Engaddi, below its abundant freshwater spring, whither all the supplies from Jerusalem and Hebron were directed, and from whence the several excursions, crossing the lake in all directions, set out. Soundings were thus taken in 155 different places. They only avoided the neighbourhood of the fetid sulphurous springs abounding about the lake, because the gases exhaled by them had a very injurious and paralyzing influence on the bodies and minds of the men, when superadded to the withering heat of a blazing sun, and the tropical closeness of the atmosphere, rendered most heavily oppressive at such a low absolute level as that of the surface of the Dead Sea. A hot south-wind, or sirroco, burning like the blast of a furnace, and accompanied with constant sheet-lightning, would spring up now and then, and affect the party with irresistible drowsiness; and the steersman, who was the commander, being the only individual on board that succeeded in keeping his spirits up and in remaining sufficiently awake to take care of the safety of the boat, while the men, who looked ghastly pale, and were sunk in a profound sleep verging upon torpor and deathlike stillness, might well have likened himself to Charon ferrying souls over the river Styx.

The triangulation and survey of the whole lake was, however, completed amidst such trying vicissitudes, the spirits of the men being constantly revived again, and the first map of the Dead Sea was laid down accordingly. Its basin, it appears, is divided into

two bottoms, the northern one, comprising two-thirds of the whole, descends to a depth of 100 to 1300, or even 1970 feet in one place (according to Symonds), whereas the southern one, comprising the remaining third, is but a shallow salt-lagoon, presenting a depth of not above 18 feet, generally not above 6 feet, or even of one and a half feet. This shallow bottom is, for the greater part, only filled with salt mud, which is so much heated by hot springs below, that the men could not wade through it without pain when they left the boats to go ashore at the southern extremity of the lake, in order to climb up the famous salt-pillar of Usdum, which is about forty feet high, and to which the legend of Lot's wife is still referred, its name being evidently but a slight corruption of Sodom. But this salt-pillar is no more than the abutment of a long dyke of rock-salt stretching underground into the country of the Edomites. The few natives on the shore, a miserable tribe of the Fellahin, who had never seen any vessel, were astonished at the sight of the two boats, which they took for animals, although they could not conceive how they could walk on the water without legs, till they were shown the oars. Only a negro boy shouted with joy when he saw them, being struck with a sudden remembrance of the boats he had seen floating on the Nile in his early childhood.

Every part of the lake having been coasted and examined, and collections of their natural productions having been made, they returned to the northern end of the Dead Sea. The level of the surface of the lake had been found to be more than 1300 feet below that of the Mediterranean; and that of the deepest parts of the bottom, being the greatest absolute depression on the earth's surface, had been determined at 2462 feet below the level of the Mediterranean. By the time the survey was finished, not only had the boats become corroded and leaky by the decomposing action of the brine, but every one of the party felt the effects of the tainted and oppressive atmosphere, and of the excess of exertion; and it became of urgent necessity to exchange that sultry tropical climate, whose vegetation bears the character of tropical India throughout, for a more congenial one, in order to check those diseases the symptoms of which had already begun to declare themselves.

Before breaking up the encampment at Engaddi, the American expedition managed to construct a large raft on which the flag of the United States was hoisted, as an emblem of the conquest of the Dead Sea, and this raft they moored at a considerable distance from the shore, where the depth was 480 feet, so as to be quite out of the reach of the Arabs. On the camp Lieutenant
Lynch

Lynch had solemnly conferred the name of Camp-Washington, in honour of the great founder of the United States.

APPENDIX.

It was only about the middle of January, 1850, after the above lecture had been read, that I was favoured by Mr. Mason, secretary of the Navy, to whom I feel most gratefully obliged, with the report that Lieutenant Lynch had made to the Navy Department of Washington, on the scientific results of the observations and calculations relating to the expedition; wherefore I have to add the following emendations. The information communicated above could only be taken from the narrative of the United States Expedition to the river Jordan and the Dead Sea, by W. F. Lynch, commander of the Expedition, 1849, London, 8vo., and it is only through the said Report that the following corrections, which interest us more nearly here, have become known:—

	French Feet.
1. Level of the surface of the Lake of Tiberias below that of the Mediterranean	612
2. Level of the surface of the Dead Sea below that of the Mediterranean	1235
3. Therefore the whole fall of the Jordan between the two lakes amounts to	623
4. Maximum depth of the Dead Sea, according to Lynch's soundings	2462
5. Elevation of Jerusalem above the Mediterranean	2449
6. Elevation of Jerusalem above the Dead Sea (2449 + 1235)	3684

Berlin, 29th January, 1850.

C. R.

MODERN.

MODERN 'SPIRITUALISM.'

Phases of Faith, or Passages from the History of my Creed. By
FRANCIS WILLIAM NEWMAN. Chapman. London, 1850.

THIS is one of the most recent publications of a new school of sceptical literature which has sprung up among us. For of the existence of such a school none, we think, can entertain any doubt, who are at all familiar with the somewhat handsome volumes ever and anon issued by Mr. Chapman, in whom its writers seem to have found an available centre and sympathising patron of their literary activity. Diversified as are the titles of these volumes they have all, more or less, the same aim. They bear all more or less directly against the authority of Christianity in any orthodox form in which it is received. This clear *drift* combines the otherwise dissimilar topics which they embrace.

It is not very easy to characterise in any general terms this *modern infidelity*, ranging, as it does, the whole gamut of unbelief, from the extremes of a bare deism on the one hand to those of a sublimated pantheism on the other, and often dissolving into the vague and indefinite utterance of an unintelligible mysticism. Proteus-like it changes its hue and shape under any careful attempt to fix its features and analyse their meaning. With an affectation of novelty, it is yet, when its pretensions are fairly sifted, found to be very much the same old adversary that was satisfactorily demolished more than a century ago. It has refurbished itself, no doubt, from the armoury of German rationalism, and learned a somewhat different nomenclature; but the more familiar one becomes with its mode of argument and dialect, the more is it perceived to be essentially just the same meagre and worthless thing. Deism and rationalism, we know, are names which, for the most part, it repudiates. *Spiritualism* is its watchword: but when we come to examine this spiritualism, we find it just to be the old thing under a new name. The sufficiency of man's natural powers to instruct and guide him in all that pertains to his religious faith and duty is equally its conclusion. With our older race of unbelievers, it is true, the appeal was more commonly to the adequacy of man's natural reason for this purpose, while with the present race it is rather to an *inner religious light*, or higher soul, in every man. But even so far, there is nothing really original in the writers of this school, as all are well aware who
have

have any acquaintance with the works, either of our own Deists or of the German Divines; for what is the 'natural instinct' of Lord Herbert of Cherbury, and the 'inward sentiment' of such writers as Jacobi and De Wette, for example, but just the spiritual light, or 'soul,' to which Mr. Newman appeals? We readily own that, in contrast with many of the deistical productions of a past age, and especially of the Voltairean scepticism of last century, a higher and more moral spirit characterises the present sceptical writers.^a They manifest, upon the whole, neither the savage vehemence of hostility to Christianity which have rendered infamous the names of Toland, Chubb, and Paine, nor the unscrupulous dare-devil spirit of mockery and piquancy and profligacy which stamped the labours of the patriarch of Ferney and many of his *confrères*; but if their tone be thus improved, their dislike of the Christian truth is evidently no less intense, and there is something to us occasionally even more dreadful in their blasphemy, from the quiet decency of expression in which it is uttered.

It is to be feared that the class of writings of which we speak is exercising a considerable influence, especially upon many young minds of our day. Nothing, perhaps, is more characteristic of the present age than an excited spirit of inquiry about religious subjects with a great shallowness and deficiency of religious knowledge. Questions, which our fathers were content to ponder with a patient humility, and in regard to which they have transmitted to us a vast store of profound learning, are now hastily entertained and as hastily dismissed by minds utterly incompetent to the task, either from their own previous training, or from any adequate measure of acquaintance with the past literature bearing upon the points in discussion. A self-conceited incredulity—an unsettledness even as to the very foundations of religious belief, is, as a consequence, widely prevalent,—a fact of which such books as the one before us are at once an evidence and a cause. We have thought it right, therefore, to look a little into the pretensions of this school, by passing under our review the present volume, among the most recent, as we have said, and, certainly, one of the most plain-spoken and intelligible of its class.

Francis William Newman, its author, is, indeed, if not the Coryphæus, (a character which we believe he would honestly disclaim,) yet one of the most prominent and noticeable of the group of writers comprising this school. And it is certainly a singular

^a This is constantly asserted in their behalf, as something that quite distinguishes them from past infidel writers, and renders their scepticism peculiarly formidable. And we readily concede it so far, although such writings as those of Lord Herbert of Cherbury, mentioned in the text, show that the present writers are by no means singular even in this respect.

enough circumstance, and one strikingly indicative of the religious disorganisation of our day, that the two brothers Newman, whose early educative discipline, it is presumed, must have been very much the same, should be found, at this moment, occupying such opposite and extreme positions in the religious world. If we mistake not, very much the same mental tendencies, the same characteristic indecision and restlessness of intellect, amounting even in both occasionally to positive weakness, have conducted them by divergent paths to such widely-apart conclusions.

The volume before us is of the nature of a spiritual autobiography. It professes to detail the successive 'phases of faith' through which its author passed to his present position of downright infidelity—for it is no other. And there is at times an air of candour and simplicity about the narrative very *unique* and interesting. We smile, involuntarily, as we read, at the *naïveté*, or the ignorance, which, in the character of so many of its disclosures, furnishes their own best and most effectual answer. The narrative is divided into 'periods,' and the first period, which bears the title 'My Youthful Creed,' thus opens:—

'I first began to read religious books at school, and especially the Bible, when I was eleven years old; and almost immediately commenced a habit of secret prayer. But it was not until I was fourteen that I gained any definite idea of a "scheme of doctrine," or could have been called a "converted person" by one of the evangelical school. My religion then certainly exerted a great general influence over my conduct, for I soon underwent various persecutions from my school-fellows on account of it; the worst kind consisted in their deliberate attempts to corrupt me. An evangelical clergyman at the school gained my affections, and from him I imbibed more and more distinctly the full creed which distinguishes that body of men—a body whose bright side I shall ever appreciate, in spite of my present perception that they have a dark side also. I well remember that one day, when I said to this friend of mine, that I could not understand how the doctrine of election was reconcilable to God's justice, but supposed that I should know this in due time if I waited and believed his word—he replied, in emphatic commendation, that this was the spirit which God always blessed. Such was the beginning and foundation of my faith—an unhesitating, unconditional acceptance of whatever was found in the Bible.'

Here we have obviously a very honest statement. The passage, in truth, bears strongly that air of *naïf* and undisguised confession to which we have already adverted: and we have extracted it as furnishing, in our opinion, a not inappropriate key to the whole volume,—as pointing in some measure to the explanation of all the subsequent 'phases' of the spiritual history which it records. The religion of his youth Mr. Newman describes as an '*unhesitating, unconditional*

unconditional acceptance of whatever was found in the Bible,' which, according to his own previous statement, clearly means of *whatever his spiritual instructors taught him was found in the Bible*. Now this, which was the only religion possible to him as a boy, appears in our humble judgment to have been the only religion which Mr. Newman ever possessed. He seems to us never to have got beyond the leading-strings of teachers of some sort or another. In youth, of course, he could have no other basis of his creed than authority, but there is, so far as we can see throughout the volume, not the slightest evidence that he ever attained a more intelligent and profound basis for the Christian convictions which he professes to have abandoned. There is no evidence that he ever verified for himself any of the Christian doctrines. This, with his present views, Mr. Newman might perhaps say was impossible,—alien and abhorrent as he conceives these doctrines to be to the genuine spiritual consciousness. But it is of great importance thus to remark in the outset his exact relation to Christianity. He is not at all, it appears to us, in the position of one who having once fully seen the reasonableness and worth of the Gospel, has yet, by the strong incursions of a dark spirit of doubt, been driven from the 'good hope' which he cherished. For this is no doubt a possible case, apart from all controversy, as to whether it can ever happen that one who has really known the truth, can yet be *ultimately* alienated from it. Many of the noblest minds are known to have passed through such periods of bitter and hopeless perplexity, when they could no more find 'rest unto their souls' in the 'old paths' in which they had once trod with security. And the sceptical difficulties of such minds, laid, as it were, on the rack of their own too curious questioning, must ever engage our deep sympathy and pity. But we cannot reckon Mr. Newman amongst this class. For not only does he seem to us never truly to have apprehended the Gospel in its deeper, spiritual meaning, and in the vital peace which it imparts to all who thus know it, but not even to have apprehended, with any measure of logical coherence, the 'scheme of doctrine' which in his youth he identified with it. Nothing can be more crude and undigested than some of his 'evangelical' notions, showing how little he ever understood even the right *form* of the truth which he had been taught. The views imbibed from his teachers seem not even intellectually to have been in any *thorough sense* appropriated by him,—so as ever to have exhibited to him a consistency of outline and detail—but only to have been stored away in his mind as separate fragments of theological opinion not thereby necessarily inoperative upon his life—as indeed he says they were not,—but hence incapable of sustaining any sudden shock of argument or speculation. This may seem a strong conclusion

clusion to build upon the slender data which we have yet presented ; but it is a conclusion which has been irresistibly suggested to us in turning to the opening paragraph after a perusal of the volume, and we shall be able, if we mistake not, to furnish many proofs of it as we proceed. Mr. Newman has seemed to us, in the words we have quoted, to indicate sufficiently the *secret* of his subsequent abandonment of his 'youthful creed.' That creed appears never to have been to him anything more than a set of intellectual notions, imperfectly understood, and received on the *authority* of this or that teacher, or of this or that evangelical book. There is no evidence that it ever had a vital hold on his spiritual being ; but, as we shall afterwards see, decided evidence, from his own confession, to the contrary. It was the inevitable fate of such a creed to fall to pieces before a real spirit of inquiry once awakened within him. We are especially struck with the evidence furnished to the truth of what we say by the fact—a singular one certainly—in such a book as this, professing to be the history of an earnest mind under religious conflict—of the total absence of any trace of those dark and upheaving struggles so natural to a mind in such a case. If Mr. Newman has known such struggles he has kept them to himself. But our own strong conviction is that he has not known them. Quick and lively as may be his emotions, his is evidently not one of those strong comprehensive natures which powerfully own the moral necessities to which the Gospel addresses itself. Even when professedly evangelical in his creed, the great mystery of *guilt* seems little to have touched him. The awful question, 'How shall a man be just before God?' seems never to have really moved him : and having never lain under these dark shadows he is of necessity singularly free from all profound spiritual perplexity in abandoning the Gospel. It is true that he speaks of perplexities enough, but only such perplexities, it appears to us, as naturally arose from the disturbance of the amiable relations in which he had hitherto lived, caused by his wayward and erring course. There is much about the alienation of old friends, and the social and personal sacrifices he endured ; but no trace almost can we find of those fearful inward struggles which might be supposed to toss, as on fiery billows, one who daily felt as he did, 'the God and immortality of his childhood disappearing from before his doubting eye ;'^b—*none* of those *sospiria de Profundis*—those strong cries from the depths of an unutterable sorrow, which, we cannot help conceiving, must ever wring the soul of one in such an awful predicament ;—nothing of these do we find in Mr. Newman's volume, but only, as it honestly appears to us, the amiable

^b Schleiermacher.

difficulties of a good and evidently sweet-tempered man, who, having been trained in evangelical principles, without having ever yet mastered them, feels himself compelled under the impulses of an unrestrained scepticism to abandon them one by one. We do not for one moment deny the thorough truthfulness of the course which Mr. Newman has run; nor undervalue the earthly sacrifices which it may have cost him. All we would imply is, that to us and to the world in general it is *nothing*. It gives us no insight; it teaches us no lesson: and just because we do not see that Mr. Newman has ever really lain under the burden of those questions which his book is yet meant to decide. There *may* be much in this volume of interest in reference to what is sometimes taught as Christianity, or as to the manner in which it is taught; but in reference to the truth or worth of *Christianity itself* it has, we conceive, absolutely no bearing—Mr. Newman having traversed only in *dreams* that divine land of promise of which he gives us such empty and beggarly tidings.

With such religious views and feelings as we have seen, Mr. Newman went, at the age of seventeen, to Oxford. There, apparently, with the very first exertion of his intellect began the demolition of his 'youthful creed:' and we cannot help feeling that there is something almost amusing in the facility with which the clumsy and ill-assorted fabric tumbles down. He had been taught by evangelical books so and so; a friend suggests a doubt of what he had thus learned, and, after showing fight for a little,—he says, after a 'rather sharp controversy,'—he takes to the study of the matter for himself; and by and bye acknowledges his conversion to the views of his friend. In case it should be thought we are drawing a caricature, we give his own words in reference to his 'first effort at independent thought against the teaching of his spiritual fathers:—

'I had learned,' he says, 'from evangelical books, that there is a *twofold* imputation to every saint, not of the sufferings only, but also of the "righteousness" of Christ. They alleged that while the sufferings are a compensation for the guilt of the believer and make him innocent, yet this suffices not to give him a title to heavenly glory, for which he must over and above be invested in active righteousness, by all Christ's works being made over to him. My new friend contested the latter part of the doctrine. Admitting fully that guilt is atoned for by the sufferings of the Saviour, he yet maintained there was no further imputation of Christ's active service, as if it had been our service. After a rather sharp controversy, I was sent back to study the matter for myself, especially in the 3rd and 4th chapter of the Epistle to the Romans; and some weeks after, freely avowed to him that I was convinced.'

Now,

Now, not to insist upon the evidence which this passage bears to our statement, that he seems never really to have apprehended with any degree of consistency and penetration the scheme of Evangelical doctrine which he professes to have abandoned—how very clear is it that the moment in which he lays aside the peculiar view in question is just the moment when he first really begins to think of it. Previously it is as evident as possible that he had never exercised his mind on it at all; but simply received it, with much more undigested stuff, we dare say, on the authority of the Evangelical books to whose teaching at this time he entrusted himself. Only when the view is questioned does he first seriously turn his thoughts upon it. Only after a breach has been actually made in his belief does he begin to examine the stability of its foundations. There is thus the latent spur of scepticism in the very first movement of his religious inquiries. And all along it is singular to remark how much he owes this spur; how entirely his successive investigations seem to be called forth by the interrogatories of doubt; how little by the spontaneous suggestions of a patiently inquisitive mind in quest of deeper and more comprehensive views of the truth.

Having so briskly begun the 'effort at independent thought,' our author proceeds apace. In opposition to the rigorous notions in which he had been trained, he embraces what he calls the 'Oriental heresy' about Sunday; and he gives up Infant Baptism. We cannot dwell upon these opening manifestations of the sceptical spirit which at last so entirely subdues him, farther than to point out another marked feature of mind with which they have impressed us, and which has an important bearing upon the whole character of the volume. Mr. Newman seems never content to rest in any medium position. No sooner is he unsettled at one extreme than he rushes to the other with a self-confidence and a seeming amazement at the absurdity of his former position, which, under all his semblance of truth-seeking, conceals a powerful habit of dogmatism. Ceasing to believe any point, he at once comes to consider it as unquestionably false and incredible, and must always pass to the very opposite pole of opinion. This Mr. Newman and his fellow-labourers may call 'independence of thought;' but it appears to us truly in a very different light. These same questions, for example, of the observance of Sunday and the validity of Infant Baptism, are, to say the least, questions of grave moment and considerable difficulty, and have given rise to a vast deal of learned and forcible argument on both sides. It might be supposed, then, that the candid and earnest examination of these questions would have occasioned our young student not a little perplexity, and that he would have felt himself for a time moved, now to the one side and
now

now to the other, of the controversies respecting them. Nay, we venture to say that the higher and more comprehensive the mind engaged in such an examination the more likely would it be thus to oscillate for a little between the two sides, feeling their respective strength. Such a grave hesitancy and humble distrustfulness in the investigation of difficult and important subjects, so far from being, as the vulgar opinion is sometimes apt to regard it, a mark of incapacity, is one of the most characteristic traits of genuine mental power. But little, if anything, of this do we find in Mr. Newman. Scarcely, if at all, does he pause amid the conflict of the controversies which he presumes to settle, so as to leave any impression upon the reader's mind of his having really entered into and pondered the opposing arguments; but with a strange and astounding agility, he clears the barriers of the most formidable reasoning, and having got to the very opposite side, where he must always be, looks round in wonder, apparently, that he should ever have been on the other. This may indicate a certain kind of dexterity, but not exactly the dexterity we should choose in a religious guide; the dexterity of a quick and lithe, yet not strong or masterly intellect; and whatever may be Mr. Newman's qualifications otherwise, he is not, therefore, exactly the man, we should say, to lead on a new 'phase' of the religious sentiment in this country.

This conclusion, which is already forced upon us by the disclosures of the first 'period,' is confirmed still more strikingly by those of the second, which bears the title of 'Strivings after a more Primitive Christianity.' One of the most remarkable features of the author's history during this period is the strange ascendancy acquired over him by 'one powerful mind, and still more powerful will.' This powerful mind and will are embodied in the person of a young relative of a gentleman in Ireland, in whose house Mr. Newman spent fifteen months as private tutor. There is something so racy and piquant in the mere sketch of this person, apart from the illustration it gives of Mr. Newman's character and his relation to Christianity, that we present it at some length:—

'His bodily presence,' he says, 'was indeed weak. A fallen cheek, a bloodshot eye, crippled limbs, resting on crutches, a seldom shaven beard, a shabby suit of clothes, and a generally neglected person, drew at first pity with wonder to see such a figure in a drawing-room. It was currently reported that a person in Limerick offered him a half-penny, mistaking him for a beggar; and if not true, the story was yet well invented. This young man had taken high honours in Dublin university, and had studied for the bar, where, under the auspices of his eminent kinsman, he had excellent prospects; but his conscience would

would not allow him to take a brief, lest he should be selling his talents to defeat justice. With keen logical powers he had warm sympathies, solid judgment of character, thoughtful tenderness, and total self-abandonment. He before long took holy orders, and became an indefatigable curate in the mountains of Wicklow. Every evening he sallied forth to teach in the cabins, and roving far and wide, over mountain and amid bogs, was seldom home before midnight. By such exertions his strength was undermined, and he so suffered in his limbs, that not lameness only but yet more serious results were feared. He did not fast on purpose, but his long walks through wild country and indigent people inflicted on him much severe deprivation; moreover, as he ate whatever food offered itself—food unpalatable, and often indigestible to him—his whole frame might have vied in emaciation with a monk of La Trappe. Such a phenomenon intensely excited the poor Romanists, who looked on him as a genuine “saint” of the ancient breed. The stamp of heaven seemed to them clear in a frame so wasted by austerity, so superior to worldly pomp, and so partaking in all their indigence. That a dozen such men would have done more to convert all Ireland to Protestantism than the whole apparatus of the Church establishment, was ere long my conviction, though I was at first offended by his apparent affectation of a careless exterior. But I soon understood that in no other way could he gain equal access to the lower and lowest orders, and that he was moved not by asceticism, nor by ostentation, but by a self-abandonment, fruitful of consequences. He had practically given up all reading, except that of the Bible; and no small part of his movement towards me soon took the form of dissuasion from all other voluntary study. In fact, I had more and more concentrated my religious reading on this one book; still I could not help feeling the value of a cultivated mind. Against this my new eccentric friend (himself having enjoyed no mean advantages of cultivation) directed his keenest attacks. I remember once saying to him, in defence of worldly station—To desire to be rich is unchristian and absurd; but if I were the father of children, I should wish to be rich enough to secure them a good education. He replied: “If I had children, I would as soon see them break stones on the road as do anything else, if only I could secure to them the Gospel and the grace of God.” I was unable to say, Amen, but I admired his unflinching consistency; for now, as always, all he said was based on texts aptly quoted, and logically enforced. He more and more made me ashamed of political economy and moral philosophy, and all science; all of which ought to be “counted dross for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus our Lord.” For the first time in my life I saw a man earnestly turning into reality the principles which others confessed with their lips only. . . . I once said: “But do you really think that *no* part of the New Testament may have been temporary in its object? for instance, what should we have lost if St. Paul had never written the verse: ‘The cloak which I have left at Troas, bring with thee, and the books, but especially the parchments.’” He answered with the greatest promptitude: “I should certainly

certainly have lost something ; for that is exactly the verse which alone saved me from selling my little library. No ! every word, depend upon it, is from the Spirit, and is for eternal service.”

The person thus described, Mr. Newman says, ‘rapidly gained an immense sway over me.’

‘For the first time in my life I found myself under the dominion of a superior Henceforth I began to ask, what will *he* say to this or that ? In his reply I always expected to find a higher portion of God’s Spirit than in any I could frame for myself. In order to learn divine truth, it became a surer process to consult him than to search for myself. . . . Indeed but for a few weaknesses which warned me that he might err, I could have accepted him as an apostle commissioned to reveal the mind of God.’

If our readers were not already sufficiently impressed with the peculiar *facility* of Mr. Newman’s character, and his most imperfect conceptions of Christianity, the above extracts must, we think, more than convince them of both. We can scarcely imagine a more innocent and *telling* betrayal of amiable weakness and ignorance. That the portrait he here draws should have so powerfully affected him, and the view of Christianity he here exhibits should have so engaged his sympathy, may be creditable to his heart ; but what a mere child and dreamer do they show him to have been as to Christianity itself. We know nothing more noble or beautiful than the picture of a high and devoted enthusiasm in the cause of religion. It claims our highest admiration and honour. But who does not see in the sketch before us, besides the glow of enthusiasm, the traits of a pure, downright fanaticism ? The idea of any one gravely arguing in the nineteenth century, as this ‘Irish clergyman,’ for the neglect of the cultivation of the intellect, and the contempt of science, is something peculiarly preposterous ; but when, as we read subsequently, we find him believing that the doctrine of the second advent of our Lord *totally forbids all working for earthly objects distant in time*, we can only smile at such sheer insanity :—

‘Let the dead bury their dead,’ he would say ; ‘and let the world study the things of the world : they know no better, and they are of use to the Church, who may borrow and use the jewels of the Egyptians ; but such studies cannot be eagerly followed by the Christian, except when he yields to unbelief. In fact, what would it avail even to become a second La Placé, after thirty years’ study, if in five-and-thirty years the Lord descended from heaven, snatched up all his saints to meet Him, and burned to ashes all the works of the earth.’

When Mr. Newman could stumble at such sentiments as these, uncertain whether or no they were demanded by Christianity, it is really no wonder that he should by-and-bye have come to

discard a religion associated in his mind with such gross absurdities.

But we must now somewhat more rapidly trace the development of his scepticism. An intervening mission to Persia, in company with some friends, which furnishes in its conception and execution on his part some further striking indications of the peculiar simplicity of his character, was the means of ripening within him the sceptical tendencies which had already at the university manifested themselves, but which had been restrained under the sway of 'the Irish clergyman.' Freed from the somewhat magical control of this influence, he makes rapid progress in unlearning his 'youthful creed.' After a two years' residence in the East, he returns to England an unbeliever in the doctrines of the Trinity and of the personality of the Holy Spirit. We cannot dwell upon his slight attempts at reasoning in the former of these subjects, being, as they are, the mere repetition of the supposed intellectual contradictions involved in the doctrine. Mr. Newman might have learned better than this from some of his German teachers. They might have taught him how much deeper than any mere difficulties in its logical explication the truth of such a doctrine *necessarily* lies. But while Mr. Newman has imbibed much from Germany, his affinity is invariably to the negative and not to the positive side of its theology.

On his return home he found himself immediately in a crowd of difficulties from the report of his heresy having preceded him: and at this period, if at any, he seems to have been powerfully and deeply affected by a sense of the career upon which he had entered. But the repeated perusal of his narrative does not leave the impression upon us that the perplexities which now beset him, painful as they may have been, were of that purely spiritual kind which we have desiderated. They may in some degree have been so. God forbid that we should judge him harshly in the matter. All we say is, that there is *to us* no evidence of this in the confessions of the volume. We see no trace of the spontaneous workings of a soul in conflict and agony under the burden of so momentous a crisis in its history. No doubt he suffered bitterly; this is fully seen. The reproaches of friends, and the social ban which seems to have pursued him, must have been sore trials to one of so sensitive and affectionate a nature. But all this is a very different thing from what we mean. The petty persecution of which he conceives himself to have been the object, had, however, a very decided effect in stimulating the sceptical spirit which now so fully possessed him. Recovering from a temporary prostration, he speeds onwards on his course, with a haste and confusion which render it no longer easy to follow him. 'Calvinism

is

is abandoned : ' then the ' religion of the Letter renounced : ' then ' Faith at second hand found to be vain : ' and long before he has reached the conclusion of these successive periods he has laid aside all that is distinctive or positive in Christianity. It were idle for us to attempt to trace Mr. Newman minutely through these downward stages of his career. It is often very difficult for us, in fact, to catch any continuous thread of development in his progress henceforward. There is no longer the same natural and spontaneous flow in the narrative, but rather a continual aspect of special pleading. All manner of objections, critical and moral, are brought together against the Gospel, and set out in a sort of pell-mell array, in which we have utterly failed at times to see the least glimpse of coherence or intelligible succession. We can only endeavour, therefore, to test the general character of his reasoning by specimens selected here and there.

We are not concerned to defend against him the mere peculiarities of Calvinism. It has, however, we may say, little to fear from such an assailant as Mr. Newman. His mental grasp is altogether too slight, and his moral penetration too superficial to enable him to cope for a moment with the many theological masters who have stood forth in its defence. All we would observe in reference to this period of his spiritual history is that, in abandoning Calvinism, he seems virtually to have abandoned the Gospel. The ' revolution,' which in his own words laid the one ' prostrate in his mind,' seems also to have left in ruins the other ; so that at the close of this period, not only the peculiar formulæ of Calvinistic doctrines, but the great *facts* of Christianity seem to have become dim and uncertain to his apprehension. Nor can we forbear noticing further, in illustration of all we have already said as to his most inadequate conception of the Gospel, how entirely from the beginning he has failed to deal with these facts as appealing to the spiritual consciousness. This, the real question as to the adaptation of Christianity to our moral necessities, and its consequent worth as a system of divine education for training our moral powers to their highest bent and richest fruitfulness, is never once touched by him, and simply because he himself has never felt this adaptation. The spiritual depths which respond to the Gospel have never been fully stirred in him : and hence he has never really entered into its essential meaning. How true all this is, let the reader judge from what he records at the close of this period. ' I can testify,' he says, ' that the Atonement may be dropped out of the Pauline religion without affecting its quality.' . . . ' In all the workings of my mind about Tri-Unity, Incarnation, Atonement, the Fall, Resurrection, Immortality, Eternal Punishment, how little had any of these to

do with the inward exercises of my soul towards God.' How little could one who has thus written, have ever understood the Gospel! How little could he have comprehended its significance or felt its power when he could conceive, nay, aver, that he had certified in his own experience the fact, that the Atonement may be eliminated from the religion of St. Paul without affecting its quality; and that the inward exercises of his soul towards God had little or no dependence upon the views he entertained of the Fall, Redemption, and Immortality. And seeing Mr. Newman could write thus, how should he have ever thought of recording the phases of his faith? how should he have ever thought that 'passages' from the history of his creed which were of so little consequence to himself, could possess interest or consequence to others—*passages* which appear, from his own confession, to have been virtually *in vacuo*, the great elements of Christian truth having as much, or rather as little, vital relation to his spiritual being at the beginning as at the end?

It may seem, perhaps, to some, that we have made too much of this ignorance of the Gospel on the part of Mr. Newman, as bearing upon the worth of his testimony regarding it, especially as it is a matter which cannot well be absolutely determined. We have dwelt upon it, however, simply because so strongly and repeatedly forced upon us in the perusal of his volume. It betrays itself so remarkably, that in urging it, as we have done, we have merely obeyed the most vivid impression which the book has left upon us. Mr. Newman himself seems clearly to have anticipated such a mode of reply to his confessions. Nor is he anxious to repel it; he is rather content to have it urged, as it were a poor sort of answer that can only prove satisfactory to the 'evangelicals' who make it. 'I know,' he says, towards the close of his volume, 'that many evangelicals will reply, that I never can have had "the true" faith, else I could never have lost it: and as for my not being conscious of spiritual change, they will accept this as confirming their assertion. Undoubtedly I cannot prove that I ever felt as they now feel.' It is always very easy to escape, under such sort of contemptuous indifference, from the stress of an uncomfortable objection brought to bear against us. But whatever be the merits of the ready-made test which Mr. Newman conceives the so-called evangelicals would apply to him, it is not, evidently, such a test that we have applied. It is by no means merely from the simple fact of his having abandoned the truth that we have concluded him never to have really known it, but from the actual evidence which, to our minds, his pages bear to this effect. It is an induction which we have legitimately drawn from the phenomena of the case as exhibited by himself, and not an *a priori* conclusion grounded on its
its

its mere statement. And if the induction should seem in any degree harsh, or even be false (for the question, from its nature, cannot, as we have said, be *absolutely* determined), it may yet be a perfectly fair and well-founded one, from the facts before us. Of its being so we cannot, indeed, entertain any doubt.

Having got quit of Calvinism, and virtually, it appears to us, of Christianity, Mr. Newman still professes 'to have held fast an unabated reverence for the moral and spiritual teaching of the New Testament, and not to have had the most remote conception that anything could ever shatter his belief in its great miracles.' It was obviously impossible, however, that he could long remain in this position, and accordingly he soon began to impeach the veracity of Scripture. He first came to recognize circumstantial inaccuracies in the sacred record, then to doubt of its inspiration, and then to question the miraculous element in it altogether. We feel at a great loss to select specimens of his mode of procedure in his now rapidly downward course. His mixed confessions and arguments are such a confused jumble, and often start in the most flimsy and superficial manner questions so important, that to deal with them effectively would lead us into long detail. This, however, we do not feel we are called upon to do, even did our space and inclination permit us. Of the cool confidence, and most uncritical assumption with which Mr. Newman settles things, let the following examples suffice :—

'About this time,' he says (p. 127), 'the great phenomenon of these three Gospels, the casting out of devils, pressed forcibly on my attention. I now dared to look full into the facts, and saw that the disorders described were perfectly similar to epilepsy, mania, catalepsy, and other known maladies. Nay, the deaf, the dumb, the hunch-backed, are spoken of as devil-ridden. I further knew that such diseases are still ascribed to evil genii in Mussulman countries; nay, a vicious horse is believed by the Arabs to be *majnun*, possessed by a jin or genie. Devils also are cast out in Abyssinia to this day. . . . The devils cast out of two demoniacs (or one) are said to have entered into a herd of swine. This must have been a credulous fiction.'

It would be difficult, we think, to find a more consummate specimen of unwarranted allegation in the shape of argument, than the foregoing. Observe, 1st, how, without a shadow of proof, he at once identifies the demoniac possession of the Gospels with epilepsy, &c., a question which *per se* is one of the most difficult of the Gospel history, and the common orthodox opinion of which is, in the main, confirmed by the most thorough recent views.^c Observe, 2ndly, how by a mere side stroke he would leave it to

^c Neander, in his *Denkwürdigkeiten*, &c.

be inferred that the cures performed by Jesus were nothing more than those which are performed in Abyssinia to this day. And lastly, notice his summary mode of disposing of the miracle of the devils cast out and entering into the swine. '*This must have been a credulous fiction.*' Does Mr. Newman really suppose this to be reasoning? Our readers, we feel, must think that we are expending any sort of reply unnecessarily upon one who pretends to argue in such a fashion against the credibility of the Gospel miracles.

But here again see how he disposes of the Old Testament record. The paragraph really admits of no answer save itself. It is impossible, however, to conceive any more adequate :—

'After this it followed,' he says, 'that the so-called canon of the Jews could not guarantee to us the value of the writings. Consequently, such books as Ruth and Esther (the latter indeed not containing one religious sentiment) stood forth at once in their natural insignificance. Ecclesiastes also seemed to me a meagre and shallow production. Chronicles I now learned to be not credulous only, but unfair, perhaps so far as actual dishonesty. Not one of the historical books of the Old Testament could approve itself to me as of any high antiquity, or of any spiritual authority; and in the New Testament I found the first three books and the Acts to contain many doubtful and some untrue accounts, and many incredible miracles.'

After these specimens of Mr. Newman's powers as a scriptural critic we do not think our readers will thank us for any more; they must feel satisfied that the Bible stands in no jeopardy at his hands. We must not, however, pass by some samples of a more general kind of reasoning in the concluding 'periods' of the volume.

The 'religion of the letter' having been renounced by him, he next finds 'faith at second hand to be vain.' He is led to engage in an entirely new inquiry as to what he calls 'the essential logic' of the investigations which had hitherto employed him; and the result is, that he comes to discredit the validity of all miraculous testimony to moral truths. The following illustration really embraces the sum and substance of his argument upon the subject :—

'I conceived of two men, Nathaniel and Demas, encountering a pretender to miracles, a Simon Magus of the Scriptures. Nathaniel is guileless, sound-hearted, and of strong moral sense, but in worldly matters rather a simpleton, and mistakes a juggler's tricks for supernatural wonders. Demas is a sharp fellow, who gets on well in the world, quick of eye and shrewd of wit, hard-headed, and not to be imposed upon by his fellows, but destitute of any high religious aspirations or deep moral insight. The juggleries of Simon are readily discerned by Demas, but thoroughly deceive poor Nathaniel: what then

then is the latter to do? If we enact the rule that men are to "submit their understandings" to authoritative miracles, and that revelation is a thing of the outward senses, we alight on the undeniable absurdity that Demas has faculties better fitted than those of Nathaniel for discriminating religious truth and error, and that Nathaniel, in obedience to eye and ear, which we know to be very deceivable organs, is to abandon his moral perceptions.'

Apart from the taste of this illustration, which we shall leave to speak for itself, how completely false and inapplicable is it! How ludicrously does it conceal and distort the real question as to the *character* of the miracles performed—insinuating, as it were, the level of the Gospel miracles to that of those of ordinary jugglery. Can Mr. Newman really so deceive himself, and are we to believe him sincere, in drawing such a parallel as the above? We are very reluctant to doubt his perfect honesty. It is a matter with which we would rather not concern ourselves. But there are many indications in the latter half of the volume besides those we have already given which leave a painful impression upon us that we are no longer listening to a Nathaniel confessing himself, but to a Demas making out a case. There is a degree of perverse misstatement and sleight of argument, which, while it can mislead none who know anything of the subjects, has all the air of throwing dust in the eyes of the young and unwary reader. Whether this be really a clumsy trick of jugglery, or arise simply from Mr. Newman's incapacity to enter into the real merits of the question, and conduct a high argument, we leave to others to determine: for ourselves, we are fully inclined to believe the latter.

Meanwhile, during the progress of his inquiry into the possible validity of miraculous testimony, 'new breaches,' he says, 'were made in the citadels of his creed which had not yet surrendered.' He begins to see that it is all a mistake as to the Reformation being the result of the re-awakened study of the Bible. It was, on the contrary, all owing to the intellectual excitement which followed the revived cultivation of Greek and Latin literature. Not only so, but at length he perceives—

'how untenable is the argument drawn from the inward history of Christianity in favour of its superhuman origin. In fact, this religion cannot pretend to be a *self-sustaining power*. Hardly was it started on its course when it began to be polluted by the heathenism and the false philosophy around it. With the decline of national genius and civil culture it became more and more debased. So far from being able to uphold the existing morality of the best pagan teachers, it became barbarised itself—from ferocious men it learned ferocity.'

Nay, more, it seems, 'the facts concerning the outward spread of Christianity have also been disguised by the party spirit of Christians.'

Christians.' All that we have hitherto believed on this subject turns out to be the most monstrous delusion. Even Gibbon, with his enumeration of secondary causes, did not half see the truth, according to our advanced infidel of the present day. The fact is, and the statement well deserves the italics Mr. Newman has given it (such an *eureka* cannot be proclaimed too significantly): '*It was the Christian soldiers in Constantine's army who conquered the empire for Christianity.*'

After this we may well say anything: and we feel that our readers' patience must be getting exhausted under such a mingled exhibition of inconclusive reasoning and presumptuous assertion; we will, therefore, only delay them by a single extract farther, and it shall present, as it were, the culmination of Mr. Newman's unbelief—the rank consummate weed that has sprung from the bitter root of his scepticism. Speaking of the argument drawn from the character of Jesus to the truths of Christianity, he says—

'I do not at all see how the uneducated can judge of the literary question, "Whether it is or is not for the portrait of Jesus to be imaginary and unreal?" Heroes are described in superhuman dignity; why not in superhuman goodness? Many biographies overdraw the virtues of their subject. An experienced critic can sometimes discern this; but certainly the uncritical cannot always. I remember, when a boy, to have read the Life of Fletcher of Madeley, written by Benson, and he appeared to me an absolutely perfect man; and at this day, if I were to read the book afresh, I suspect I should think his character is a more perfect one than that of Jesus.'

We have given these extracts almost without comment, as needing none. They serve to exhibit very strikingly the fatal restlessness and facility of Mr. Newman's intellect, of which we have already spoken, and which totally incapacitates him for the impartial and comprehensive discussion of religious questions. That any man in our day should speak as he has done of the influence and spread of Christianity, whatever might be his speculative opinions, argues either the most deplorable perversity or the most deplorable ignorance. He has once or twice made mention of the venerated name of Neander, although in a way calculated to leave upon the mind of the reader a very erroneous impression as to the import of his theological labours. We commend to his perusal the Church History of that great teacher, if it may yet be that any historical exposition, however exhaustive and convincing, would avail against such hapless and feeble *bigotries* (for they are nothing else) of scepticism as the above. As to the last quotation, we refrain from characterising it. It has filled us with a very peculiar feeling of revulsion, which we hesitate to express,
in

in pity for the spirit which animates it and the fearful blindness in which alone it could originate.

And now we must take leave of Mr. Newman in a word or two of general remark. Having descended as he has done with such a sad acceleration into the gulf of what he calls Spiritualism, but which is neither more nor less than pure Deism, what reason has he for believing that he will not descend further into the yawning pit of Pantheism, which he still professes strongly to repudiate at the close of this volume? Having gone on, ever changing and exhausting his creed, what assurance has he that he has at length stopped? We see no guiding principle under which his course has been hitherto run; why then should he not run on, impelled by the unrestrained spirit of negation, to which he has yielded till he sunk into the absolute *nihilism* of some of his German friends? We see no reason why he should not; and certain we are that all the tendency of his book is towards the dark and barren abyss of utter Scepticism. The 'Progress' he speaks of is sheer destruction.

But, again, Mr. Newman professes, under all his changes, to have retained unimpaired his moral perceptions, and even to have advanced their pure development. And it may be so. There may be (it is barely possible) something so peculiar in his idiosyncrasy, that such has been the result in his case. But how little can he know that the same result will take place in others. Nay, if he is not absolutely blind to all the ordinary phenomena of history, must he not feel it to be a most critical and dangerous thing in a *moral point of view* to unsettle the faith of the young—that faith associated with all the holiest lessons of a mother's love and a father's wisdom; a thing so awful in its possible consequences as to make any man who cares for the well-being of his fellow-creatures to pause ere he attempt it? Has Mr. Newman thus considered the evil of his present sedulous task? Has he, a teacher of youth in one of our metropolitan institutions, realised the fearful responsibility he is incurring in the issue of such a volume as the above? Does he really believe the fancied modicum of truth he professes to have reached, after all his wanderings, to be of such value as to lead him to encounter any moral evil to his readers in its dissemination? Has he pondered these questions? If he has, he is certainly more bold than he is wise. If he has not, he has certainly need to do so.

But are our fears withal extensive on the score of this modern infidelity? There can be no doubt that it is meanwhile exercising a considerable influence for evil upon the young especially, as we have already expressed our belief in the outset, and for some time longer it will probably continue its mischief; but so flimsy
and

and borrowed an affair cannot long stand an intelligent scrutiny. So soon as the aspect of novelty wears off, even the young will begin to learn its meagre pretensions and to see the emptiness of its boastful generalisations, and it shall be literally buried in the obscure grave which itself has prepared; while the old truth shall shine out more radiantly than ever, in renewed loveliness and strength, acquired in the wholesome process of conflict and victory.

J T

PARALLELISTIC POETRY.

THE earliest poetry, that we know of, we find in the inspired records; and to the peculiar rhythmical form in which it is cast has been given, in later times, the name of parallelism; and its general characteristic features are so sufficiently recognized under that name, as not to need a particular description. That this arrangement constituted the poetry of the Hebrew people there is no doubt, and it pervaded their literature from the commencement of their existence as a nation until their dispersion; yet still to designate it as the Hebrew metre, is not a correct mode of expression. Of course the Hebrew books are the most ancient existing documents, and we have none that can lay any claim to authenticity that are prior to, or contemporaneous with, the writings of Moses, which can throw light upon the subject;* on investigating those writings, however, it seems plain that the system of parallelism, or, as it is variously called, 'the metre of things,' 'verse-rhythm,' or 'thought-rhythm,' was not the invention of the Hebrews, nor was the use of it confined to them; but that it both constituted the form of poetry among the nations that were their contemporaries, and was prevalent as a means of

* We ought perhaps to make an exception in the case of the hieroglyphical writings of the Egyptians, which doubtless, if they could be interpreted with certainty, would illustrate in many respects the poetry of the earlier times, as being a written language of things or ideas, as that was a poetry or rhythm of things. Plato, in his second book of 'The Laws,' ascribes an antiquity of ten thousand years to some of the Egyptian μέλη, or poems, which he speaks of as being 'written, or delineated,' τετυπωμένα, meaning, of course, hieroglyphically written: and he also says, that having been preserved for a long course of time, they were called the Poems of Isis. This hieroglyphic writing, being a written language of things, was probably always understood, or read, rather by traditional interpretation than grammatical instruction. Some of the above remarks may perhaps also apply to the recently-discovered inscriptions at Nineveh.

pleasure,

pleasure, and vehicle of instruction and of religious influence, long before they were a people.

The prophecies of Balaam, an inhabitant of Mesopotamia, and the chants of the Amorite poets (Num. xxi. 27-30), which were of sufficient importance to be again quoted, or rather adopted, by Jeremiah (xlviii. 45, 46), show that its use was common among the eastern nations; and that its origin dates earlier than the time of Moses, will also appear on going through the Book of Genesis. We find there that a very high and, as it were, sacramental importance was attached to the last prophetic speeches or blessings of the patriarch-priests of the præ-Mosaic dispensation; and these are given in parallelistic metre. The words of Noah, in which are blended both a benediction and a denunciation, which are still traceable in the relations of the peoples of the earth, are instanced by Lowth (Prælec. IV); as also the blessings of Isaac on his two sons; and again of Jacob; the words of Sarah at the birth of Isaac are said by a Jewish writer to be in rhythm; and, too, the blessing pronounced by her kinsmen on Rebecca (Gen. xxiv. 60). And though it may be said that these prophetic sayings, being of such deep importance, were invested by Moses or some other with a poetic garb, that as national traditions they might be preserved the better; allowing this supposition to be a possible one, yet it is certainly more reasonable, and more in accordance with what we know of inspiration, to believe rather that the patriarchs, when under a strong supernatural impulse, improvisedly gave utterance to their fervent thoughts in the solemn lilt, the *šep mashał*, which was appropriate to prophecy.^b The other speeches of a religious kind which occur in Genesis confirm the rightness of this view: such are the speech of the angel to Hagar (Gen. xvi. 11, 12), the answer of the divine oracle to Rebecca (Gen. xxv. 23), which are obviously in parallelisms; and the blessing pronounced on Abram by Melchizedek, which falls at once into the solemn distichs of the *Mashał* (Gen. xiv. 19, 20):

‘And he blessed him, and said,

Blessed be Abram in God Most High,
Who establisheth heaven and earth :^c
And blessed be God Most High,
Who delivereth up thy foes in thine hand.’

^b The application of the word *προφήτης* by St. Paul to Epimenides (Tit. i. 12), and the two-fold meaning of *Vates*—*vate sacro* (Horace, lib. iv. ode 9)—and *Bard*, will occur to the reader in confirmation of what is stated.

^c In this blessing of Melchizedek, as also again in the speech of Abram to the king of Sodom (xiv. 22), we find the formula which seems to have constituted the sole article of the Patriarchal Creed, viz., belief in ‘*The Most High God*, *יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ*, who establisheth heaven and earth,’ distinctly and formally enunciated.

On going back into the antediluvian period we meet at once with the address of Lamech to his wives, or, as we shall rather call it, his war-song (Gen. iv. 23, 24), which all biblical critics have decided to be poetical and parallelistic: 'And said Lamech (or Lemek) to his wives,

'Adah and Zillah, hear ye my voice—
Wives of Lemek, heed ye my saying—
For man do I slay, for my wound;
And child, for my bruise.
For seven-fold is Cain avenged,
And Lemek seventy-fold and seven.'⁴

This short rhapsody neither conveys any doctrine, nor records any fact worthy of traditionary preservation, and therefore at first it will be difficult to account for its insertion in Holy Writ; but if we allow weight to the assertion that the wife of Ham the son of Noah was Naamah, the daughter of Lamech the Cainite and Zillah, who thus survived the flood*—and the fact that the curse of Noah descended upon Canaan the son, rather than upon Ham the father, renders it in a degree probable—then we may imagine that this song of Lamech might have been preserved in her family, especially in the line of Canaan; and being handed down among the Canaanites, and even used by them as a slogan or war-cry, might have been extant in the time of Moses and known to the Israelites of his period; and so set down by him in his writings as an exemplification of the proud ferocity and vindictive daring of the early dwellers in the earth. Again, the prophecy of Enoch, preserved in St. Jude's quotation (Jude 14, 15):—

'Ἴδού, ἦλθεν Κύριος ἐν ἀγίαις μυριάσιν Ἀυτοῦ,
Ποιῆσαι κρίσιν κατὰ πάντων,
Καὶ ἐλέγξει πάντας τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς,
Περὶ πάντων τῶν ἔργων ἀσεβείας αὐτῶν, ὧν ἠσέβησαν,
Καὶ περὶ πάντων τῶν σκληρῶν, ὧν ἐλάλησαν κατ' Αὐτοῦ ἀμαρτωλοὶ
ἀσεβεῖς.

'Lo! the Lord is come in His holy thousands,
To do judgment on all,
And to refute all the impious,

⁴ This view of Lamech's speech to his wives, which is the one adopted by Ewald, who calls it 'a sword-song,' is suggested by Bishop Hall, who thus paraphrases it in his *Explication of Hard Texts*:—'And Lamech said to his wives: Adah and Zillah, what tell you me of any dangers and fears? Hear my voice, O ye faint-hearted wives of Lamech, and hearken unto my speech; I pass not of the strength of any adversary: for I know my own valour, and power to revenge; if any man give me but a wound or a stroke, though he be never so young and lusty, I can and will kill him dead.' This is certainly to be preferred to the ingenious explanation which refers the speech to Lamech's fear of punishment for having violated the original institution of marriage by polygamy.

* See *Introduction to the Books of Moses*, by James Morrison, p. 26.

For all the impious deeds, which they have impiously-done,
And for all the hard things, which against Him impious sinners
have said.'

In the course of time and by translation the words of this prophecy may be easily conceived to be somewhat changed, yet it still readily adapts itself to the parallelistic arrangement, and at the same time preserves the paronomasia or repetition of certain words, which the Hebrews at a later period certainly considered a poetic ornament. Following the subject yet one step further back, we find the same poetic rhythm, not only in the speech of Adam to Eve (Gen. ii. 23, 24), but also impressed upon the sentence of the Almighty Himself upon Adam (Gen. iii. 17-19), where the antithetic parallelism of the first lines is very marked—
'And unto Adam He said,

For that thou hast heard the voice of thy wife,
And hast eaten from the tree,
Which I commanded thee, saying,
Thou shalt not eat from it:
Cursed be the ground for thy sake;
In sorrow shalt thou eat of it, all the days of thy life.
And thorn and briar shall it bring forth to thee;
And thou shalt eat the herb of the field;
In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread,
Until thy return to the ground;
For from it thou wast taken:
For dust *art* thou,
And to dust thou shalt return.'

From these examples, and indeed from an examination of the whole series of solemn and prophetic sayings recorded in Scripture, it is clear that parallelistic poetry is of most ancient date; and we may not unfairly collect that it is the very earliest poetry, or perhaps the primal type and form of all poetical composition. In the metrical writings of the Hebrews we find other poetical ornaments: parallelism by no means excluded such; their poetic style was distinguished by the employment of striking words, *ξενικά*, the use of archaic forms, the addition of terminations, and especially by paronomasia and *τὸ ὁμοιοτέλευτον*, for which last ornaments parallelism seems to have a peculiar affinity; but these were only appendages and accidents, not constituting a passage poetry by their presence, nor entering into its essence. The simple essence of this poetry consists, as is well known, in a certain arrangement, according to which two or more propositions or sets of ideas are placed in juxta-position—*παράβολῃ*—either synonymously or in an antithetical opposition; and this juxta-position may be so varied and modified by poetical technicism, as to display every phase of
beauty

beauty or sublimity. It may swell with the most emotional grandeur, glow with the rapture of inspiration, repose in the clear, calm plenitude of intellectual light, set itself to express the mighty *dicta* of ethical and political truth,^f and in all its adaptations to its subject-matter preserve that one same form—a rhythm of ideas having a definite relation to one another, a rhyme, in technical language, of ‘complex words’—which has gained for it the name of parallelism. This we believe to be the form and εἶδος of poetry; and that from it, as from a germ, has sprung whatever of glorious, of lovely, or of true, has ever affected the spirit of man in the creations of the poetic art.

But if it cannot be shown to a demonstration that this ancient form of poetry is the archetype and first original of all poetry, if poetry be not allowed to claim an existence coeval with language, and may not—although the embodiment in words of truth and beauty—be reckoned as the gift of Him from whom cometh ‘all good giving, and every perfect gift;’ still, as it has been of old connected with Divine things, and from the first was chosen as the vehicle for the inspirations of the Paraclete, it demands attention both on critical and theological grounds: an analytical research into the nature of parallelistic poetry will be a labour that will not fail of meeting with its reward.

In the Poetics of Aristotle the definition of poetry itself, and of all divisions of it, is that they are in their whole nature imitation: *πᾶσαι τυγχάνουσιν οὖσαι μιμήσεις τὸ σύνολον* (c. 2); and as parallelism is obviously a species, if not the most perfect species, of poetry, it is, therefore, an imitation; accomplishing its imitative work, as do the other species, by rhythm, diction, and modulation: *ἅπασαι μὲν παιοῦνται τὴν μίμησιν ἐν ῥυθμῷ καὶ λόγῳ καὶ ἁρμονίᾳ* (c. 3).^g Doubtless, when, in its pristine perfection, it was duly sung or recited, it conveyed to those whose ears were rightly attuned, the highest degree of pleasure which can result from an

^f The Earl of Carlisle, in a lecture on ‘The Poetry and Genius of Pope,’ given at Leeds in December, 1850, expressed his opinion ‘that the highest of all poetry was *ethical* poetry, as the highest of all earthly subjects was moral truth’—an aphorism which will restore to its proper estimation the gnomic poetry of Scripture.

^g The same three constituents of perfect poetry are given in the third book of the Republic. Aristotle calls these a little further on, in the same chapter of the Poetics, *ῥέθμος, μέλος καὶ μέτρον*; where *μέλος* stands for harmony, and in that sense is described as *πλοκαὶ φθόγγων ἀνομοίων ἐξέτηξι καὶ βαρότητι*. The nature of the *ἁρμονία*, or modulation of the Hebrew poems, which is a constituent part of poetry, would afford an interesting subject of inquiry. The change of the Masorite accentuation in some of the poetic books seems to give some, though an indistinct, clue to the ancient system. The modern Jews have separate tones, or recitative cadences—*πλοκαὶ φθόγγων* we may call them—for cantillating the Psalms, the Prophets, and the other books. To this cantillation Cicero seems to refer (Orator. c. 8) in the following passage:—*Quum vero inclinata ululantique voce, more Asiatico, canere cœpisset, quis eum ferret? aut quis potius non juberet auferri?*

imitative art. Taking up then this idea of imitation, and going deeper into the subject, we ask, Of what is parallelism, which constitutes the Scriptural metre,^h an imitation? May it not be replied, It is a likeness of the analogy that exists throughout nature; an echo, as it might be, of the antiphone caught up successively by each work of God in the harmonious and perfect order of the universe, in which—

‘ Πάντα δισσὰ, ἐν κατέναντι τοῦ ἐνδός;
Καὶ οὐκ ἐποίησεν οὐδὲν ἐκλείπον.’

‘ All things are double, one against another,
And He hath made nothing imperfect.’

This is the graceful description given by the son of Sirach (Ecclus. xlii. 24) of the κόσμος, or whole creation and economy of the All-wise; and the ideas of regularity, adjustment, and similitude, which are the characteristics of that economy, and are implied in the word *ἔκτιστος*, seem also to be shadowed out and imitated in the parallelistic chant, the *παραβολή* of the inspired preacher or prophet of the Scriptures.ⁱ To enlarge upon this a little, though at the risk of being thought fanciful, it seems as though many of the revelations or unveilings of the hidden which the Creator has deigned to make to his creatures, are distinct settings out of this mutual correspondence between the things seen and the things unseen: manifestations of the parallelism which exists between the objects of sense and the ‘invisibilia quæ non decipiunt.’ The majority of our Lord’s parables are of this kind, authoritative discoveries of the secret coincidences between the creations of time, τὰ γιγνόμενα, and the existences of eternity, τὰ ὄντα—shadowed outlines of the perfect truth, and thus prophecies as well as parables; teaching what Plato hints at in his use of the terms *Ἰδέαι* and *εἰδωλα*—that all nature is a parable; and that not the tabernacle of the wilderness only, but the whole frame

^h Τὸ μέτρον οὐκ ἂν γένοιτο χωρὶς λέξεως ποιᾶς καὶ ποσῆς.—*Longinus, Prolegom. ad Hephaest.*

ⁱ May not the idea worked out so sublimely in the 19th Psalm, and which the heathens expressed by the harmony of the spheres,—

‘ The heavens declare the glory of God;
And the firmament sheweth his handy-work.
Day unto day uttereth speech,
And night unto night sheweth knowledge.
There is no speech, nor language,
Where their voice is not heard:
Their line is gone out through all the earth,
And their words to the end of the world.’

lie as a germ to be developed by a poet’s mind, in the expressions used of the sun and the moon in Gen. i. 18: *וַיִּשְׁלַח אֱלֹהִים בְּיוֹם מַשָּׁל*, to *Mashal* in the day and in the night?

and

And

And again, in the same manner, in Luke xxi. 29-31, 'And he spake a παραβολή to them :—

' Look ye at the fig, and all the trees,
When they already put forth buds ;
Ye, seeing it, know that summer is now already nigh :
Thus do ye also
When ye see these things happening
Know that the kingdom of God is nigh.'

Or, as St. Mark gives the same lines (xiii. 28, 29) :—

' From the fig-tree learn ye a parable.—
When now her branch is become tender,
And sprouteth forth leaves,
Ye know that the summer is near.
Thus also ye,
When ye see these things happening,
Know that it is near at the doors.'

Thus the subject-matter of all Divine or Scriptural poetry is evidently Truth ; and it has as its end to engrave it, as it were, upon the mind of the hearer. Appeals to human passions, affections, and even prejudices, it does not disregard, but uses them as means, subservient to what is more important, viz., the plainer delineation of the things which ARE. The poet-preacher—his soul irradiate with the light of God, his own being lost in the immensity of eternity—could not feign : ποιητής μὲν ἄρα ψευδὴς ἐν θεῷ οὐκ ἔν.^m He was utterly absorbed by the nature of the thought presented to his spiritual sight, and could speak only as he was 'moved by the Holy Ghost.' But the human poet has to find within himself his own inspiration, and the means of affecting others ; in the glow of his own passions, the intensity of his own feelings, the energy of his own thoughts ; and must call to the aid of his genius, when it falls short of truth, all the technicism of imitation to supply the void, and to heighten the sublimity and increase the beauty of the picture which his mind creates. He thus loses something of the purity of truth, becoming, as it were, τρίτος ἀπὸ τῆς ἀληθείας . . . εἰδώλου δημιουργός.ⁿ He seeks to reach the mind through the ear, as befits the nature of his subject-matter, by metrical arrangements of words and syllables, or by rhyming terminations. His poetry struggles upward, through words and thoughts, if it may be, to realities ; while, on the other hand, the calm grandeur and holiness of Divine truth seems to descend to men in the rhythmical poetry of thoughts and things in, as it were, a vehicle meet for its use. In illustration, we will

^m 'There is no lying poet in God.'—Plato's *Republic*, book ii.

ⁿ 'Third from the truth, the creator of an image.' A description of Homer in the tenth book of the *Republic*.

adduce the sensation of disappointment we feel on reading any version of the Psalms in rhyme or other species of metre, either in our own language or any other ;^o in comparing, for instance, any one of them as translated by the classical and correct Buchanan, with the corresponding rendering of the Vulgate, the one, with all its elegance of diction, reads poor and cold, while, through the barbarisms and roughness of the other, the poetic form unconsciously preserved shines out clear, and we feel that—

‘Igneus est ollis vigor, et cœlestis origo.’

And, too, the often quoted remarks of Johnson, in his *Life of Watts*, respecting sacred poetry, will occur directly to the reader as bearing on this point.

The short song of Lamech, however, whatever was the occasion of its composition, is a fact which stands at variance with the hypothesis of the sacred origin of poetry ; and as the context in which it occurs seems to record the Cainites as the first inventors of the Mimetic arts of poetry and music ; the ground which we have taken must be abandoned, unless prior indications of its existence and sacred nature can be traced out. We believe that they can. The authorized version renders Gen. iv. 26, ‘And to Seth, to him also there was born a son ; and he called his name Enos ; then began men to call upon (or, to call themselves by) the name of the Lord.’ The latter part of this verse, which is confessedly a difficult passage, the LXX. render, *Οὗτος ἤλπισεν ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου τοῦ Θεοῦ*, ‘He hoped to call upon the name of the Lord God.’ The Vulgate, *Iste cœpit invocare nomen Domini*, ‘He began to invoke the name of the Lord ;’ and accordingly, the Romanist writers, and especially Bellarmine (*Liber de Monach. lib. ii. cap. 4*), understand it of the first establishment of Monachism, to which they also refer Enoch’s ‘walking with God.’ Puritan writers, again, saw in it the præ-Mosaic institution of the Sabbath ; but the original *וַיִּקְרָא בְנֵי אָדָם בְּיֵהוָה* may be literally and naturally translated, ‘In his time it was begun to preach in the name Jehovah,’ i. e. he was the first who solemnly discharged the prophetic office ; and in so doing used the formula *וַיִּקְרָא*, ‘Thus saith the Lord,’ which was the usual preface of the *Masbal*. We find precisely the same phrase repeated in 1 Kings xviii. 26, *וַיִּקְרָא בְנֵי אָדָם בְּיֵהוָה*, ‘and they spoke aloud in the name Baal from the morning even to the mid-day, saying, Baal, answer ;’ and this same meaning is otherwise expressed in the 29th verse by the words *וַיִּקְרָא*,

^o In Keble’s Preface to his *Translation of the Psalms* there are some very useful and apposite remarks on this subject.

‘and they prophesied,’ or chanted as prophets do : in other places of the Old Testament, as in Deut. xviii. 19, and Jer. xxvii. 15, to ‘call in the name of’ is the same as to preach or prophesy, as also in Acts v. 28, *Μὴ διδάσκειν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦτοῦ*. To translate, then, this obscure passage thus, ‘He was the first who uttered a prophetic Mashal,’ has been shown to be at least a probable rendering. But a still greater degree of probability is gained for it by the words of St. Peter in his second Epistle, ii. 5, *Καὶ ἀρχαίου κόσμου οὐκ ἐφείσατο, ἀλλ’ ὄγδοον Νῶε δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα ἐφύλαξεν, κατακλυσμάτων κόσμῳ ἀσεβῶν ἐπάξας*; which the Vulgate rightly gives, ‘Sed octavum Noe justitiæ præconem custodivit :’ and which, as Bishop Pearson justly remarks, should be translated, ‘But he saved Noah, the eighth preacher of righteousness, when he brought a deluge upon the world of the impious, as the ordinal ὄγδοον may possibly not belong to the name or person of Noah, but to his title or office.’^p In the line, therefore, of the patriarchal-sacerdotal succession, in which Noah held the eighth place, Enos was the first κήρυξ δικαιοσύνης; being the first first-born son of Adam, after Cain had lost the priesthood by his sin; which entirely agrees with the former assumption that he began to preach the will of Jehovah in a prophetic manner; that is, in poetry divinely inspired by the Holy Spirit. This prophesying taking great effect, the Cainites, we may suppose, being ingenious men, adopted the new invention, as they would esteem it; and perverting it from holy uses to warlike inspiration and the heightening of personal courage, produced the war-song of Lamech; which thus stands on record as the first direct abuse and mis-application of that poetic faculty which is one of the noblest gifts of God to man, and which was an instrument for his purposes in ‘the mouth of his holy prophets, which have been since the world began.’ We may add, to the foregoing examples, Gen. x. 8, 9. ‘And Cush begat Nimrod : he began to be a mighty one in the earth. He was a mighty hunter before the Lord; wherefore it is said,—

Even as Nimrod, the mighty hunter before the Lord’—

with the opinion of Michaelis thereon (*Notæ in Præl. Lowth.* 13), ‘Historici etiam carminis particulam esse suspicor quam Moses citat, *Tyrannus venatione coram Domino*. Proverbium enim fuisse vix puto.’

The results of what has been stated, which we may characterise as probable, are, that Parallelism is the earliest known form of poetry; that it may lay claim to being the highest and purest type of metrical composition; that it at first subsisted in most

^p Pearson on the Creed, Art. 11. He says, also, the Jews have a tradition that God sent in the sea upon mankind in the days of Enos, and destroyed many. From whence it seems that Enos was a preacher, or prophet.

intimate connection with sacred things, and was generally the form in which the Divine will, when manifested by words, was conveyed to man, especially to the Hebrew nation; but it was often applied to other purposes, and its use was common among the nations bordering on Palestine.

This form of metre, although consisting of several varieties according with their subject-matter, and distinguished by different names, as, for instance, שִׁיר a chant, מְזִמֹּר a lyric song, קִנָּה a dirge, and others; yet itself appears to have been known by the generic name of מְזִמֹּר. Bishop Lowth, in his 'Fourth Prælection,' says distinctly, that a poem, 'ratione dictionis et sensuum, מְזִמֹּר dicitur, quod ipsum esse arbitror *styli poetici vocabulum*;' though in other places he seems as if he would confine the application of this word to two species only, viz. the gnomic or proverbial, and the sublime or parabolic: but a search into the manner in which the word is employed in Scripture, will confirm what Michaelis points out in correction, that the word מְזִמֹּר, though sometimes it designated one species of parallelism, yet, in its right signification, was *generic* and comprehended all the species. He says (Notæ in Præl. Lowth. § 14), 'Faciliora et expeditiora hæc fiunt, si duplicem distinxeris nominis מְזִמֹּר significatum: alterum latius patentem, *quo omne carmen* ob figuratam orationem designat; alterum generi cuidam poematis, quod cantico opponitur, proprium. Ipse noster (Lowth) paginâ sequenti duplicem vim vocis intellexit, a cujus sententiâ hactenus alieni sumus, quod *non duas species* carminis, sed *genus universum*, et unam speciem, מְזִמֹּר dici putamus.' *Mashal*, then, is the generic term which expresses the poetry which occurs in Scripture; and which has been called the 'Sententious or Prophetic Style;' 'Parallelism'—'Verse-rhythm,' 'Thought-metre,' 'Dictio Parabolica,' and other names which partially but not adequately express the idea they stand for: fortified therefore by the authority of Michaelis we propose as a future designation of the parallelistic or prophetic style the term *Mashalic poetry*. The following passages will exemplify the correctness of the expression, Psalm lxi. 11, 12.

'And I took for my garment sackcloth,
And I was to them *for a Mashal*:
They revile me that sit in the gate;
And I was *the song* of the drunkards.'

Again, in Psalm xlix. 4:—

'I will give to a *Mashal* my ear,
I will open on the harp *my song*.'^a

^a מְזִמֹּר *carmen meum*.—Gesenii, Lex. in loc.

And again, the nature of the Mashal, and the Parallelism of its members, seem to be alluded to in Proverbs xxvi. 7.

‘The legs of the lame are not equal :’
So is a Mashal in the mouth of fools.’

The writings of Jesus the Son of Sirach also, which contain specimens of many sorts of poetry, had in the Hebrew copy, as St. Jerome in his preface informs us, the title of *Mashalim*; and the discourses of our Lord being called Mashalim, or Παραβολαί (compare Psalm lxviii. 2 with Matt. xiii. 35), justify the adoption of the word ‘Mashalic’ to express, specifically, the poetry of Scripture.

The different styles under which the Mashalic poetry of different prophets and inspired men presents itself at various periods, from Moses to Malachi, have already been commented on in this journal;* we would only refer now to the wonderful way in which it adapts itself to all subjects, and takes all shades of meaning and expression; preserving throughout that peculiarity which we have supposed to be the idea embodied in its original structure, of an internal and spiritual sense, dwelling within the outward rhythm and verbal arrangement; suggestive of the presence of inspiration, and leading the mind inside the embroidered veil of words to the awful sanctuary of the Primal Verity and Love, endued, too, with something of imperishability in its nature, abiding the same amidst the fluctuations of dialects, and the changes of languages, reproducing in any tongue, as if it were an universal poetry, its melody of thoughts in pristine beauty. In the writings of the second covenant, too, we everywhere see the tokens of its presence; we trace it in the words of the Baptist: it is found in each sublime and earnest passage of the apostolical epistles: it rings out in wild grandeur in the chants of the apocalyptic vision: but above all, the discourses of the Christ, which contain His laws and doctrine, display an intricate and yet harmonious alternation of lines and thoughts, which can only be described, as befitting their subject and their author. In their mysterious arrangement, as we read, we marvel—

‘Wie alles sich zum Ganzen webt,
Eins in dem andern wirkt und lebt!’

As

* ^{ללך} *deorsum pendit, nutavit et vacillavit.*—Gesenii, *Lex.*

* *Vide* the Article ‘ON HEBREW POETRY,’ in the First Number of the JOURNAL OF SACRED LITERATURE.

* Attention to the parallelistic disposition of the lines, as well in the New Testament (as Bishop Jebb as shown) as in the Old, will not only bring to light beauties of composition that lay unsuspected under the appearance of prose, but also discover niceties of expression and shades of meaning which would otherwise be overlooked.

As though there were a sympathetic connection between the sacred poetry and the sacred people, this Mashalic form had taken deep root in the Jewish mind, and was the foundation of their style, even in their prose compositions; for as St. Paul, in his epistles, it may be unconsciously, rises into poetry whenever his mind is agitated by any strong emotion, as well as in didactic passages; so in other writers, indications of its presence constantly present themselves. Among other instances, in the epistle ascribed to St. Barnabas, and certainly the work of a Jewish writer, we find, § xix.—

‘Thou shalt share in all with thy neighbour;
Thou shalt not say things are thine own.
For if ye are sharers in the imperishable,
By how much more in the perishable?’

In the first epistle of St. Clemens Romanus we find a citation from an ancient Γραφή or scripture, now lost, which, as he there quotes it, reads as prose (§ xxiii.). ‘May that scripture be far from us, where it says, “Wretched are they who are double-minded and uncertain in their minds, who say, These things we have heard from our fathers, and, lo, we have waxen old, and nothing of harm has happened to us. Oh, senseless ones! compare yourselves to a tree: take the vine; first it casts its leaves, then there is a bud, then a leaf, then a flower, and after this an unripe grape, then the perfect cluster.”’ But in his second epistle the lines are more full and the Mashalic arrangement becomes plain (§ xi.)—‘For the prophetic word says,

‘Wretched are the double-minded,
Those who doubt in their heart, who say,
All these things we have also heard from our Fathers,
And we expecting them day by day,
Have seen nothing of them.
Oh ye senseless! compare yourselves with a tree:
Take the vine *for an example*:
First, it sheds its leaves,
Then comes forth the bud,
After these the unripe fruit,
Then the perfect cluster.
Thus also my people had distresses and sorrows,
But after them it shall receive the good things.’

overlooked. An edition of the authorized version, printed conformably to the metre in the metrical portions, would be a great acquisition to English biblical students. ‘Si universa in Bibliis carmina, more poetico lineis brevibus et plerumque fere æqualibus (saltem ubi non fuerint corruptæ), nunc demum imprimerentur; mirum quantum elucesceret sacri poetæ mens, idque in mille locis; ubi sub usitatâ prosæ formâ, difficillimum est ullam, saltem veram, expiscari sententiam.’—Kennicott, *Pref. ad Vet. Test. Hebr.* § xx.

Josephus

Josephus also in his 'Wars of the Jews' (Book vi. cap. vi. § 3), gives an account of a certain Jesus, the son of Ananus, whom he described to have resembled the early prophets in his garb and manner of life, and who, animated 'by a sort of divine fury,' came up to the Feast of Tabernacles, and began 'to cry aloud' in a prophetic chant of woe, *i. e.* he 'took up his *Mashal*' in the words,

'A voice from the East—

A voice from the West—

A voice from the four winds—

A voice against Jerusalem and the Holy House!

A voice against the bridegrooms and the brides!

And a voice against this whole people!

It was the dirge of his national poetry, as well as of his nation itself; for since the fall of Jerusalem the *Mashalic* poetry has been lost as a mode of composition: and though imitations of it occur in the Rabbinical writings, yet still its very form seems, even among the Jews, to have passed out of remembrance; and it is only of late days, and by modern scholars, that its nature has been rediscovered, and its complicated and varied beauty made known.

The mention of Josephus suggests that the following fact ought not to escape the consideration of an investigator of Hebrew metre. The description of the Song of Moses (Deut. xxxii.) which Josephus gives in his 'Antiquities' (Book iv. cap. viii. § 44) is as follows:—'After this he read to them a poetic song which was composed in *hexameter verse*, and left it to them in the Holy Book: it contained a prediction of what was to come to pass afterwards; agreeably whereunto all things have happened all along, and do still happen to us; and wherein he has not at all deviated from the truth.' From this passage and from others, where he speaks of Hebrew metre,^u as also from the tract of Rabbi Azarias on Hebrew Poetry, quoted by Lowth, it would seem that the Jews were used to describe the simpler form of parallelism to the Gentiles as *hexameters*, which would indicate that in their ears what we call the two parallel members made up but one verse, which, as it generally contained *six* words or thoughts, would not be inadequately described as an hexameter. The Song of Moses would read then thus—

^u The following passages from Josephus bear on this point (*Antiquit.* ii. chap. xvi. § 4):—'Moses also composed a song unto God, containing His praises and a thanksgiving for His kindness, in *hexameter verse*, after the destruction of the Egyptians.' Also (*An.* vii. chap. xii. § 3), 'And now David, being freed from wars . . . composed songs and hymns to God of several sorts of metres. Some of those which he made were *trimeters*, and some were *pentameters*.'

הַמַּיִנוּ הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֶרֶץ וְתִשְׁמַע הָאָרֶץ אֶמְרֵי־י
 יְעֹרֶף בְּמִטְרָא לְקַחֵי תֶּגֶל בְּטֵל אֶמְרֵתִי

‘Attend, ye Heavens, and I will speak, and thou shalt hear,
 Earth, the words of my mouth;
 There shall drop as the rain my doctrine, there shall fall as the
 dew my speech,

in which collocation of the parallel hemistichs the rudiments of the Grecian hexameter, which is the most ancient existing ethnic metre, and which grammarians consider to be, like the pentameter, made up of two parts or members, may perhaps be discerned. In the classical poets hexameter lines often occur which present a strong resemblance to the double parallels of the Mashal; for instance we find in Virgil, *Æn.* ii. 56:—

‘Trojaque nunc staret—Priamique arx alta maneres!’

And again, *Æn.* vi. 165—

‘Ære ciere viros—Martemque accendere cantu.’

It is not, however, improbable that Virgil was acquainted with some portions of the Hebrew Scriptures; but the nearest approach of a classical author to the style of the Hebrews appears to have been in the Mimes of Sophron the Syracusan. We are told by the Scholiast, on a hymn of St. Gregory Nazianzen—itself written without metre, and commencing—

‘Παρθένη, νύμφη Χρίστου,
 Δόξαζε σου τὸν νύμφιον.

Virgin, Bride of Christ!
 Glorify thy Spouse’

that it is in imitation of Sophron, ‘who alone of the poets used certain rhythms and verse-members, ῥυθμοῖς τισι καὶ κώλοις, despising the usual proportion, ἀναλογίας, of poetry.’ As Sicily, from very early times, was connected with the Phœnicians, it is a probable conjecture that Sophron may possibly have *borrowed this unusual form of poetry from the parallelism of the East*.^{*} A fragment of an early Christian hymn quoted by St. Paul (Eph. v. 14) presents the same peculiarities of construction with these lines of St. Gregory Nazianzen—‘διὸ λέγει—wherefore it says—

“Ἐγείραι, ὁ καθεύδων,
 Καὶ ἀνάστα ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν,
 Καὶ ἐπιφαύσει σοι ὁ Χριστός.

Awake, thou who slumberest;
 And arise from among the dead;
 And Christ shall shine upon thee.’

^{*} Perhaps that diffuse style of eloquence abounding in pleonasm and redundancy of expressions which was called *Asiatic*, in distinction to the more concise Attic, had the same origin.

As does also; to some extent, that most divine of all uninspired compositions, the hymn *Te Deum laudamus* of the Western Church; but whether the *Te Deum* was originally composed on any rhythmic principles, or whether its author had unconsciously imitated the lilting movements of the old parallelistic style, seems as uncertain as the question of, Who was its author?

Our remarks must draw to an end; but in saying thus much upon the poetry of Scripture we have ventured but a little distance into a spacious field, and have brought away but a few ears of corn, rubbing them in our hands; for those who will come as earnest and patient labourers to the work there is a plenteous harvest to be reaped. This however we say, that those who will commence this study, in a loving and Christian spirit, can have no better initiation into the very nature of the subject than in those writings of Plato, in which are set out his views of religious and national poetry. The instinctive affinity which his mind had for truth is marvellously shown in them. With him poetry, as influencing the soul, is one of the most powerful efficient for producing a good character and of a right education; and, as such, calls for the greatest attention from a legislator who would govern the State in the most perfect manner. Accordingly in the 2nd and 3rd, and also in the 10th book of 'The Republic,' and still more fully and clearly in the 2nd book of 'The Laws,' he analyses and displays the defects of human poetry, as typified by Homer, and explains his own exalted ideas of what poetry ought to be. He expresses his longings for a more grave and severe poetry, αὐτοὶ δ' ἂν τῷ αὐστηροτέρῳ καὶ ἀηδεστέῳ ποιητῇ χερῶμεθα.^a Without fiction, showing forth truth only in both moral and divine things^b—not creating a short excitement, and being the pastime of an hour, but taking an enduring share in the formation of a perfect character, and that not of the individual only, but of the state, as σώφρονός τε καὶ ἀγαθοῦ ἥθους ἀδελφὰ καὶ μιμήματα^c—breathing nought but righteousness, faith, and fortitude; in the perfect beauty of which the Pleasant as such has no place, and the Right is the sole constituent, καὶ τούτοις δὴ τοῖς τὴν καλλίστην ᾠδὴν τε ζητοῦσι καὶ μοῦσαν, ζητητέον, ὡς ἔοικεν, οὐχ ἥτις ἡδεῖα ἀλλ' ἥτις ὀρθή.^b And all poetry in which these requisites were not found he cast aside, and the hymns to the gods, and the praises of the virtuous were only to have a place in the ears and hearts of the citizens of his republic, εἰδέναι δὲ (χρὴ) ὅτι ὅσον μόνον ὕμνους τοῖς θεοῖς καὶ ἐγκώμια τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ποιήσεως παραδεκτέον εἰς πόλιν.^c We compare those outlines of what perfect poetry ought to be with what

^a *Repub.*, b. iii. § 9.^b *Ibid.*, b. ii. § 21.^c *Ibid.*, b. iii. § 11.^b *The Laws*, b. iii.^c *The Repub.*, b. x. § 7.

we find in Scripture, with the hymns of Moses, of David, or of Asaph, with the lofty strains of Isaiah or Habakkuk, or with Jeremiah's sorrow-solemn dirges; and at first we can scarce tell which feeling prevails at the coincidence we find, whether admiration at the prescience of the philosopher, and his strange insight into what was fit for man; or a sense of all gratitude to Him, who gave in part to the Jewish, and in fullness to the Christian Church, 'the oracles of prophets, the music of psalms, the instruction of proverbs,' for training men in obedience and faith. We know that the Church has the means of education which the philosopher had despaired of for his self-imagined polity; that God has given to us what Plato plainly saw could only be given by Him, or by His inspiration—poetry, stamped with the seal of authority, in no point failing of what is right—*τοῦτο δὲ Θεοῦ ἡ θεία τινὸς ἀνείη.*^d W. F.*

ON THE DAIMONIAIC POSSESSIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

It is now generally admitted that the deities worshipped by heathen nations of antiquity were of human origin. A knowledge of this fact would naturally lead the inquirer to expect that each nation would have had gods peculiar to itself. This expectation is verified by history. Every country and every city had their protecting or tutelary deities. These beings had been raised to divine honours on account of superior skill in some art or science, or because of some benefits they had conferred on mankind.* In their exalted sphere they were therefore supposed to be the guardians and directors of those matters in which they had excelled. Consequently we find gods of war and gods of peace, gods of the sea and gods of the land, gods of virtue and gods of vice, the very diseases even which afflicted humanity were believed to be sent by those gods that presided over such diseases. It is this last sphere of their influence we desire to investigate at present, hoping by such investigation to throw some additional light on the various passages in the New Testament in which accounts are given of daimoniatic possessions.

^d *The Laws*, b. ii.

* In the Article on 'THE MESSIAS AS PROPHET,' Vol. VI. No. XI., the reader is requested to correct the following erratum at p. 185:—For *Συμπαρεΐαι*, read *Οἱ Συμπαρεΐαι λόγοι*.—Arist., *Poetics*, § 3.

^a Plut., *De Isis et Osiris*, et *Vit. Rom.*

It may be right here to mention that the name 'Daimon,' $\Delta\alpha\iota\mu\omega\nu$ or $\Delta\alpha\iota\mu\acute{o}\nu\iota\omega\nu$, is that which was generally given to their gods by the writers of antiquity. This name does not convey the idea of malignity of nature or moral evil, and must therefore be carefully distinguished from the English words *demon* and *devil*, both of which, according to the common acceptation, imply these qualities. The term $\Delta\alpha\iota\mu\acute{o}\nu\iota\omega\nu$ seems to have been one of considerable latitude of meaning. In some places it would appear to signify an inferior order of gods, while in others it is taken as a distinguishing name of the Supreme Deity.

The belief that daimons had power to take possession of the bodies of mortals and inflict diseases was first received in Egypt and Chaldæa. In the former place, according to Celsus,^b the human body was thought to be governed by no less than thirty-six spirits. Accordingly when any one was suffering under disease of whatever form, it was believed that a daimon concealed in the body of the patient was the original author of the calamity, and consequently, instead of treating the disease as arising from some organic affection, or from some derangement of the system, their physician exorcists had recourse to charms, to sounds of various sorts, and to mysterious words and names, which, in their opinion, were calculated to expel the troublesome spirit. The origin of the use of these charms, and their occasional success, may be accounted for on rational grounds. Some of the charms were herbs and roots, but it is well known that certain herbs and roots possess such medicinal properties as when administered to effect a change in the bodily organs, and are thus capable of checking and curing many diseases. Now that most of the diseases which the nations of antiquity ascribed to the power of daimons were produced by purely physical causes is admitted, and the medicinal qualities of these roots being known to many of the ancients when they were administered, the patient the while firmly holding his peculiar superstitions, and the operator accompanying the administration by grotesque gestures and mystic incantations; and when these roots proved effectual in checking the malady, the natural conclusion drawn was, that the roots were displeasing to the afflicting daimon, and consequently by their proximity he was forced to evacuate. Josephus speaks of a power possessed by Solomon over such malignant spirits, and says: 'He composed such incantations also by which distempers are alleviated; and he left behind him the manner of driving away daimons so that they never return.'^c And in another place he speaks of a certain root which 'is only valuable on account of one virtue it has,

^b Cel. *Ad Orig.*, lib. viii.^c *Antiq.*, lib. viii. chap. ii. sec. 3.

that

that if it be only brought to sick persons, it quickly drives away those called daimons, which are no other than the spirits of the wicked, that enter into men who are alive and kill them.^d Many of the afflictions also which had their true sources in weakness and exciteableness of the nervous system were ascribed to the action of daimons. Medical men bear testimony to the effect a confident assumption of power to cure such individuals exercises upon them; and when such persons were induced firmly to believe that daimons had taken possession of their bodies, and when they saw before them a professed and famed exorcist going through strange ceremonies, repeating mysterious incantations, and at last, in a voice of authority, commanding the indwelling daimon, in obedience to the power of some mystic name, to depart, it is not to be wondered that a salutary effect should thus sometimes be produced upon them. It is remarkable also to observe the effect which sounds, and especially chords of music, produce upon delicate, nervous temperaments, whether to soothe or excite them. We believe that in this may be found the true interpretation of that passage where David is represented as playing his harp before Saul when the evil spirit came upon him, and of the previous anxiety the servants of Saul had shown to procure a skilful performer.*

These strange doctrines being held by the two great nations with which the Jews had most intercourse, it is not remarkable that they were imbibed by many among them. From Egypt they carried with them to Palestine superstitious practices and false dogmas which prevailed even to the time of the captivity; and from Babylonia they received a new stock that served them from that period to the Christian era. In our Saviour's days we know from Scripture and from Josephus,^f that these opinions regarding daimon tormentors prevailed to a very large extent, and that numbers of professed exorcists went about practising these incantations. Many firmly believed in their power, confirmed as it seemed often to be by the circumstances we have alluded to. Pythagoras brought his system of philosophy from Egypt and Chaldea; and he, with his followers in Italy and Greece, adopted

^d *De Bel. Jud.*, lib. vii. chap. vi. sec. 3.

* These remarks will, we think, afford a satisfactory explanation of those passages in which Josephus speaks of the success of the exorcists in his day. They also throw light on Luke xi. 19, and Acts xix. 13. It will be evident to the attentive reader of Scripture that there must have been a great and marked difference between the power displayed by Christ in casting out daimons, and that shown by the ordinary exorcists, who, having considerable medical skill, made that the evidence of their assumed magical power. See Luke iv. 36, and ix. 43; Matt. ix. 33; Mark v. 20, &c.

^f *Antiq.*, lib. viii. chap. ii. sec. 5.

these views.^s Plato, who was favourable to the tenets of Pythagoras, publicly taught and defended the same opinions. The Gnostics, who desired to combine the mystic philosophy of the East with Judaism and Christianity, could not be supposed to have rejected so prominent a point. We even find that some of the purest of the Christian fathers held corresponding views concerning the power of daimons. Tertullian writes thus: 'They are also the authors of bodily diseases and severe accidents.'^h Cyprian, Lactantius, and Justin, give expression to similar sentiments in various parts of their writings.ⁱ Relics of this belief have survived the dark ages, and may still be seen as misty spots amid the general effulgency which philosophy, science, and the Gospel have shed upon these lands. We can perceive yet in those retreats where superstition lurks, herbs and roots hung round sick beds, charmed amulets and rings worn as a protection against evil spirits, and, especially in popish countries, the custom prevails to a large extent of fastening what are called *gospels*, that is, passages of Scripture written on scraps of paper, either round the neck or to the clothes, that by the holy words inscribed on them evil genii may be scared away. The writer has often seen these gospels and witnessed the feelings of reverence with which they were regarded by their possessors. He has seen in hundreds, among the Irish Roman Catholics, small rods of osier twisted into rings and worn as defences against evil spirits and accidents, and as preventatives of certain forms of disease, which power they were believed to possess because they had been carried to *mass* on *Palm Sunday*, and then sprinkled with holy water.

It is in India, however, that in the present day we can see this ancient superstition fully preserved. Recent inquiries among the Hindoos, and examinations of their practices and doctrines, have shown that their belief regarding the power of daimons in producing the various forms of disease both of mind and body, precisely accords with that of the Egyptians of old, of the Pythagoreans and Platonists of a later age, and of the Jews in the time of our Saviour. The very terms the Hindoos employ in designating the tormenting daimons are the same as those employed in the writings of the above-mentioned nations and sects. They have their 'blind spirits,' 'dumb spirits,' 'spirits of infirmity,' just as we have them in the Gospels. They have their exorcists too; and their mode of casting out the daimons is found to correspond with that of the exorcists who practised nineteen

^s Jamblichus, in *vita ejus*.^h *Apol.*, chap. xxii.ⁱ Lactantius, *Instit. Div.*, lib. ii. ch 15; Cyprian, *De Idolor. Vanitate*.

centuries ago ; and even the replies of the 'possessed' would seem in some instances to resemble those given by the daimonacs of antiquity.^k This will not seem at all strange to those who have studied the history of eastern nations. Egypt, Babylonia, and India, derived their systems of religion and philosophy from one source. An examination of the sacred buildings and images of Egypt and Hindostan shows such a striking resemblance between them as is sufficient to prove a similarity of origin in the people and in their religious systems.

We have been at pains to give a full outline of the universal prevalence of the belief in daimoniac possessions among ancient nations, as well as of its existence in India at the present day, lest it should be supposed that ignorance of these facts might have affected the statements we are about to make, or influenced us in the conclusions we will draw. Arguments have been advanced, founded on these facts, tending to overthrow the authority of Scripture, and represent Christ as a deceiver. We wish to lay down as broad a groundwork as these opposers of Revelation would do, and still prove that the building they profess to rear up upon it, does not rest upon it at all. We grant them their premises, but we call in question the soundness of their conclusions. And we are the more anxious to give some time to this subject as it must be seen how reluctant commentators of late years have been to sanction anything like spiritual influence upon man, even though it be taught in plain terms in the Word of God. The rationalism of Germany has given a new phase to Scripture interpretation in this respect, the spread of which in this country we would greatly lament.

It is at once granted that a large majority of those diseases which by the nations of antiquity were attributed to daimons, were the result of functional derangement ; it is granted that the system which we have unfolded was a false one ; but can this affect the reality of daimoniac possession in the days of our Lord ? We maintain it cannot even touch the question. The rationalistic argument stands thus : 'Many of the diseases which the Egyptians, Greeks, &c., believed to be caused by daimons, proceeded from natural causes, therefore there were no real daimoniac possessions in those days.' Or should they wish it, we confine the argument to Palestine : 'The Jews superstitiously and falsely held that many diseases were produced by the action of malignant

^k See some ingenious articles on this subject in the *Dublin University Magazine* for 1848. The principle contended for in these articles is essentially wrong ; it is that which Hobbes set forth in his *Leviathan*, and which Dr. Farmer has so fully illustrated in his *Essay on Daimoniacs*. But we direct attention to these articles as containing many highly interesting facts and much sound Scripture criticism.

spirits,

spirits, which had their true origin in organic derangement or other physical causes; therefore there were none really afflicted with evil spirits.' By what rules of logic are such conclusions deduced? Are we to believe, because the nations of the world held false notions regarding daimons, that therefore there were none? Or are we to conclude, because the Jews assigned to them undue power over mankind, that therefore they possessed no power at all? The arguments against daimonic possession must be set forth in a more logical form than this, or they will scarcely carry conviction with them. The real historic evidence in favour of them must first be refuted, or at least greatly weakened, ere such arguments as these will have any weight with the inquirer after truth.

But there has been a physiological argument raised against them also. We are told that the symptoms of the diseases which in the New Testament are ascribed to the action of daimons, are precisely similar to those that are the characteristics of certain well-known forms of mental and bodily ailments in the present day. For example: one individual who is possessed has all the symptoms which are now known to attend and to be the marks of *lunacy*; another has the symptoms of an *epileptic*, and so on; and from these circumstances the conclusion is drawn that those spoken of were simply epileptics and lunatics, and only possessed with daimons according to the false belief of the illiterate. If logic be violated by the former mode of argument, philosophy suffers by this. What, we ask, is *epilepsy*, and what is *lunacy*? They are words. But *words* and *causes* are very different things. Is epilepsy the cause of the sore torment which the afflicted person suffers? Is it not rather the term by which we designate the malady? Daimons might be causes, as they are represented as spirits possessed of certain powers, but *words* cannot be causes. The causes of many diseases cannot be traced by man; it is therefore wrong to conclude *physiologically*, that daimons never produced such mental and bodily tortures.

A new, and, as it seems to us, a singular argument, has lately been raised against the reality of daimonic possessions. Inquiries among the inhabitants of India have shown that the old superstitions of Egypt and Judæa exist still among them. They, as we have seen, have their daimoniacs and exorcists. Now it has been said that the preaching of the Gospel in that country, and the setting forth as true those Bible stories about daimoniacs, would have a pernicious influence upon the Hindoos—it would establish them in their superstitions, and, what is worse, lead them to rank Christ among mere ordinary exorcists. Or, on the other hand,

hand, when, from the increase of knowledge and the advancement of medical science in this country, they would be brought to see the falseness of that system which they before believed, then this very advancement of knowledge might give a deathblow to Christianity; as they would naturally conclude the possessions of the Bible, and their own, were alike untrue. Hence, say our opponents, in order to avoid such things, we must explain away in some manner the words of Scripture, lest they should thus mislead the ignorant or excite the sneers of the learned. We would at once enter a solemn and earnest protest against such a mode of argumentation. It usurps for man a power which God alone possesses, that of dictating the means best calculated to advance Christianity. If God has given the Bible to the world, is it for man to dress it in a new garb ere he put it into the hands of his fellow man? Must he first submit it to a rigid scrutiny, and purge it of such matter as, in his estimation, might prove detrimental to those for whom it was intended? Let the Bible be examined. We are pleased to see it under the critic's eye. We rejoice when the giant intellect of the philosopher is directed to its great truths. But let it be studied with a view honestly to unfold *all* that God has revealed there. Let there be no theorizing about expediency, that Scripture may be glossed over to accord therewith. Scripture, moreover, has nothing to fear from the advances of knowledge. Doubtless there are truths in it which the powers of the human mind are unable to grasp, and which man cannot therefore explain; but of all the doctrines taught there, that are within reach of the intellect, none are found opposed to right reason and sound philosophy. It is the same in the natural world. There are regions in space the astronomer, even by his most powerful instruments, has never been able to explain; and there are systems booming in the distance, whose outlines he may trace, but so dim and indistinct are they, that he can form no idea of their true features or regulating laws. Give him a clearer vision, give him the eye of omniscience, and past experience assures him he will at once perceive the beauty of their mechanism, and the wisdom displayed in the laws that govern them, notwithstanding the apparent confusion that seemed to pervade them when viewed in the distance. And only expand the intellect of the theologian, give to him the mind of Deity, and he too will at once perceive how gloriously any doctrine of Scripture harmonizes with eternal truth. Let there be no attempts made therefore to explain away any of the doctrines of God's Word, though they be inexplicable to human wisdom. It is only because the eye is weak that the object seems dim.

But

But even overlooking such things, these arguments could have no weight with the inquirer, we care not how anxious he might be on the subject of Indian missions. The superstitious belief in the power of daimons was as widely spread and as generally credited in the days of our Saviour as it can be in India now; and yet our Lord did not fear that his cause would suffer, or his honesty be put to question, by plainly teaching the reality of daimoniac possessions.

Hitherto we have only been considering the negative side of the question, we now proceed to examine what is written regarding daimoniac possession, and this we will do, first, in order to show the reality of the possessions; and, second, to give such views of their nature as we may be able to deduce from the accounts given of them.

1. We find in various passages in the New Testament actions ascribed to daimons, and these actions clearly distinguished from those of the individuals possessed; we find also that they are represented as holding conversation with Him who cast them out. In the case of the two men who met Jesus in the country of the Gergesenes, the words of the daimons that dwelt in them are related with all the clearness of ordinary narration: 'If thou cast us out, suffer us to go away into the herd of swine. And he said unto them, Go.' (Matt. viii. 31, 32.) It was not the men who were possessed that addressed Jesus; the language is plain, and must refer to spirits dwelling in them, and distinct from them. If no such spirits existed, then there is only one conclusion left us—the words were meant to deceive and mislead. And on reading further, we not only hear their words but see their acts, and the effects that followed them: 'And when they were come out they went into the herd of swine, and the whole herd ran violently down a steep place into the sea, and perished in the waters.' There must surely have been personality there. Many persons witnessed the miracle; could they have been deceived? The whole city was moved because of what Christ had done; would the city have been thus excited by a phantom of the imagination?

2. A knowledge greater than that which the Jews possessed is ascribed to these daimons. In one place it is said, 'He suffered not the daimons to speak, because they knew him' (Mark i. 34). In another a daimon is represented as saying, 'What have we to do with thee, thou Jesus of Nazareth? I know thee who thou art, the Holy One of God' (Mark i. 24). In another instance the spirit worshipped Christ, and then 'cried with a loud voice, What have I to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of the most high God?' (Mark v. 6, 7.)

3. A careful perusal of various passages in the New Testament

shows that all diseases were not by the sacred writers ascribed to the work of daimons, so that in this respect they cannot be said to have fallen into popular errors; and besides that there is a clear distinction drawn between ordinary forms of diseases and daimoniac possessions, both as regards the individuals affected and the power employed in making cures. See the distinction in this passage, 'They brought unto Him all sick people that were taken with divers diseases and torments, and those which were possessed with daimons, and those which were lunatic, and those that had the palsy' (Matt. iv. 24). If lunacy and daimoniac possession were the same, why distinguish them here by separate names? If the sacred penmen only wrote in terms of the popular superstition, why did they not follow these fully? See also, in illustration of this, Matt. viii. 16; x. 18, &c. &c. It is evident there must have been some peculiar features in the case of daimoniacs to distinguish them from those afflicted with ordinary diseases. That bodily afflictions of an ordinary character and spiritual possessions should be concomitant is possible—that mental derangement and even organic affections might be produced by the agency of indwelling spirits is possible also—that those ailments resulting from the action of unclean spirits might in some cases exhibit symptoms different from those of simple organic affections, and in other cases more or less resembling them, is likewise possible. Seeing, moreover, that this subject is beyond the range of the human mind, it can neither be contrary to sound philosophy nor right reason to believe the words of an all-wise God, and implicitly to receive as mysterious though certain facts what He has revealed to us in language plain and clear.

4. But Christ himself, by his words and acts, leads the reader of Scripture to believe in the reality of daimoniac possessions, and such was evidently the impression left on the minds of the Jews. In the 12th chapter of Matthew, when disputing on this subject with the Pharisees, he takes for granted that there were such beings as daimons. On different occasions He conversed with them, commanded them to be silent, gave them permission to go to certain places and accomplish certain acts, and gave power to His Apostles to cast them out. He at least could not have given credit to, or been deceived by, popular superstition. The unseen mysteries of nature were to Him apparent as its external objects. His eye could range over the world of spirits and distinguish the acts of its every inhabitant, easily as it could trace the outlines of the Holy City from the brow of Olivet. He reigned supreme too—all created existences were subject to His control. The same power that hushed the storm and stilled the raging sea controlled the spirits of darkness and guided the spirits of light. There is, therefore,

therefore, only left us this alternative ; if these daimoniac possessions were not real, Christ was a deceiver—His whole language and actions, in reference to them, were calculated and *intended* to mislead.

The evidence for the personality of daimons is as full as that for the personality of angels. If we deny the one, there is no reason why we should not deny the other. Were there no other mention of them in the New Testament than by the use of certain terms, as 'possessed of daimons' (δαμονιζομενος) and the like, then it might be thought that these were only used in accordance with popular opinions, and it might be argued with some degree of plausibility that Christ and his Apostles had a nobler work before them than the exposing and refuting of these opinions. But when we find such distinctive characteristics, such clear marks of personality—when we find feelings ascribed to them, and actions attributed to them, it is impossible, we again state, to avoid the alternative,—they must have been real beings, or the Apostles *wilful* deceivers.

The great argument that has been advanced against this view of the subject, and indeed the only one which could have any weight against it, is this : the belief in daimoniac possessions was general among the Jews and other nations, and Jesus was *compelled* to use popular language, and to seem to admit popular errors, as otherwise he would not have been believed in or received by the people. But there is a material difference between *simply passing by* popular superstitions, and *sanctioning and adopting* them. Christ might have done the former—He might have considered the errors unworthy of notice ; but to us, at least, it seems calculated to lower and degrade His high character, to suppose that even for the purpose of doing good He should have condescended to the former. We cannot believe that the Son of God could thus have acted—speaking in commanding tones to beings which He knew had no existence—deceiving vast multitudes, and perpetuating degrading superstition, by seeming to hold converse with mere creations of the fancy.

But what necessity could have compelled the Saviour to such a course as an enlightened man in our own day would be thoroughly ashamed of ? Was He forced to use such undignified means to advance the glorious cause He had in hand ? Let us look at this view in the light of reason and history. We know there were some among the Jews—the Sadducees for instance—who gave no credit to the prevailing opinions about the power of daimons, and yet these were not execrated by the people. There were some, too, among the heathen, as the Epicureans and Aristotelians, who denied the existence of such spirits, and yet they gained many

disciples. And as Jesus and his disciples set forth *truth*, can we believe that those superstitions, which were equally opposed to, and yet did not prevent the spread of, error, would have been so fatal to its advancement? And supposing that Christ had seen it to be beneficial for the purpose of extending the Gospel thus to sanction popular errors, why should men in our day, having the same object in view, so sweepingly condemn them? In India the belief in daimon power is as prevalent now as it was in Judæa in the days of Our Lord; and if a wish to spread the Gospel among the Jews compelled Him to *adopt* their superstitions, why should a similar desire to spread the Gospel among the Hindoos compel us, not only to *condemn* theirs, but even to explain away what the Saviour had spoken? Similar causes, under like circumstances, should produce similar results. But here the causes are similar, the circumstances similar, and the results *directly opposed to each other*.^a

We will be brief in our remarks on the nature of these daimons, as this article has already been extended to too great a length.

Much confusion has arisen, and many false conceptions been generated, by the name that has been almost universally given to daimons in the English translation of the New Testament. They are called *devils*. There are three Greek words in the original to which this common translation is given; these are *διάβολος*, *δαίμων*, and *δαιμόνιον*. The first of these is universally and exclusively applied to the *Evil One*—Satan, who is justly called the *devil*, the word signifying ‘deceiver,’ or ‘false accuser.’ The other two, which are synonymous, are never applied to Satan. Viewed abstractly, they do not even carry the idea of moral evil, but rather of *power*. This important distinction is kept up in the Septuagint as well as in the New Testament. The Hebrew words, *אוי* enemy, and *אויב* adversary, are always in the Septuagint rendered *Διάβολος*, and never *Δαίμων* or *Δαιμόνιον*. The possessions mentioned in the gospels are never spoken of as being caused by the devil; the beings designated by these names are not once confounded. The statement of our Lord, ‘How can Satan cast out Satan?’ (Mark iii. 23), seems to be, but is not in reality, opposed to this view. Though it be granted, that Satan and the devil are the same, yet, as Dr. Campbell judiciously re-

^a We direct the attention of those who wish to follow up this interesting subject to Farmer's *Essay on Daimoniacs*, in which, with great learning, he endeavours to establish that view which we have laboured to refute, and would have no doubt succeeded, only for the simple circumstance that truth was against him. See also Saurin, *Discours sur la Bible*; Cudworth's *Intellectual System*; and, for a clear and concise statement of the literature of the question, Kitto's *Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature*, Art. *Daimoniacs*.

marks,

marks, 'The utmost that can be deduced from such an example is, that they—the daimons—are malignant spirits as well as he—Satan, engaged in the same bad cause, and perhaps of the number of those called 'his angels,' and made to serve as his instruments. But this is no evidence that he and they are the same.'*

We cannot, in fact, find a single passage which, when viewed in the light of sound criticism, would seem to sanction the opinion that the terms *Δαίμων* and *Διάβολος* are synonymous. The former name gives us no idea of the moral qualities of the being to which it is applied, that must be learned from the context or from accompanying circumstances. Neither does the name throw any light on the nature or origin of such beings. Whether they were the spirits of dead men to whom certain powers were given for a season, as the heathen generally believed, or whether they were fallen angels, as the Jews thought, is left uncertain. One thing, however, is evident regarding those daimons whom the Saviour and his apostles cast out, that they were always regarded by the Jews, and spoken of by the apostles, as malignant spirits. When they are described it is by such words as denote malice and evil. They are represented as bringing the most painful afflictions upon the bodies of those in whom they took up their abode. And they seem to have known that there was in store for them a worse fate than that they then experienced; 'Art thou come hither,' the daimons in the country of the Gergesenes say to Christ, 'to torment us before the time?' (Matt. viii. 29). By the Jews they were thought to be under the control of a prince called Βεελζεβοὺλ (Matt. xii. 24), a corruption, perhaps, of the name Baalzebub given in 2 Kings i. 2 to the god of Ekron; and by Christ they would seem to have been regarded as the angels of Satan. This is all the information the Scriptures give us on the subject, and it were vain to inquire farther. The investigation of the opinions of heathen nations may be interesting as showing the nature of their religious systems; but it could afford no safe guide to truth. All their opinions were grounded on mere speculation. The subject, in fact, is beyond the reach of human reason; and, since the Word of God has shed no farther light upon it, we must be content with simply receiving as mysterious truths what is there recorded, and wait until that time when, from the saints' dwelling-place on high, we will be able to look abroad over nature, and admire the infinite wisdom displayed in all those things that seem so strange while we dwell on earth.

J. L. P.

* *Preliminary Dissertation*, vi. sec. 9.

ON THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

A LATE writer has endeavoured to prove that Silas is the author of the Acts.* His theory has met with no acquiescence from biblical critics, and its author thinks naturally enough that 'this hypothesis, intended to meet a real difficulty, would seem to merit a more considerate treatment.' We shall endeavour to give it all due consideration.

To begin with 'the real difficulty,' the only difficulty we have been able to discover is this:—We are told in chap. xvi. ver. 10, that it was inferred from Paul's vision that he and his companions were called to preach the Gospel in Macedonia, and as the author speaks in the first person plural, it is evident that he was one of Paul's fellow-labourers. 'But,' says this writer,

'If Luke is the writer, and he is not to be identified with Silas, how comes it to pass that we are not informed when *he* was divinely called to the apostolic mission, or how the vision which appeared to Paul authorised him to assume that *he* was so commissioned? How are we to account for his suddenly, in this part of the narrative, speaking of himself as the Apostle's colleague in the mission? It is strange that neither Dr. Davidson nor any writer who has noticed the theory or hypothesis, which alone affords an explanation of the language, has attempted to account for its impropriety on the supposition that a nameless narrator (for Luke is never named in the history) should therein have arrogated to himself an equality with the Apostle, such as is implied by the words "The Lord had called *us*."'

Such is the so-called 'real difficulty' which this author has discovered, we suppose for the first time; and now that it is pointed out, we confess we cannot discover wherein it lies. The word '*us*' implies no equality; but, if it did, the arrogance would be as great in the case of Silas as of Luke, for Silas was not an apostle, and therefore inferior in rank to Paul. The word here obviously applies to every member of the mission, to every one of the Apostle's fellow-labourers; and as he himself has called Luke his fellow-labourer, if Luke was the author, there was the most perfect propriety in his using the expression.

As to the question 'How comes it to pass that we are not informed when *he* (Luke) was divinely called to the apostolic mission?' the answer is simply this, he has not told us. It was no part of the author's purpose to narrate the events of his own life, and certainly, when we look at the perfect abnegation of self

* *Journal of Sacred Literature*, Oct. 1850, p. 328.

which characterises the writings of the author of the Acts where we are sure he was present, such as in that most eventful portion of St. Paul's history, the voyage from Cæsarea to Italy, we shall not be surprised at the omission.

Although, however, there is no difficulty in the supposition that Luke was the author, it does not necessarily follow that he was. We may still inquire whether the arguments by which it is attempted to prove that Silas was the author have any weight.

The author of the new hypothesis begins his argument by stating that the book of Acts

‘Naturally divides itself into three parts: the first embracing the period from Pentecost of A.D. 30 to the first persecution, A.D. 37; the second from the conversion of Saul to the Council of Jerusalem, A.D. 50; the third from the union of Paul and Silas, A.D. 51, to their arrival at Rome, A.D. 61.’

We demur altogether to the last division; there is not a shadow of proof, or even of probability, that Silas accompanied Paul to Rome. We hear of all his movements, from the time when Paul chose him instead of Mark, with whom he was displeased, to accompany him on the mission in which the Gospel was first introduced into Europe. He accompanied Paul to Berea, where he remained, when the Apostle proceeded to Athens, and afterwards rejoined him at Corinth (xviii. 5).

Paul remained at Corinth (ver. 11) till the insurrection under Gallio, subsequent to which, we are told, ‘he tarried yet a good while,’ and then took his leave of ‘the brethren,’ and sailed thence into Syria with Priscilla and Aquila (ver. 18).

Now we hear no more of Silas after his arrival at Corinth. We may, indeed, suppose that he continued with Paul till he parted with the brethren there, but an author who relates so much about himself as Silas did, supposing him to be the author, could scarcely have omitted to have told us that he was with St. Paul; and an author who is so circumstantial when we know that he was actually present cannot be supposed to have been a companion of Paul in any of his voyages and travels, from the period when he left Philippi till he returned to the same place at the end of several years.

The author of the Acts has two most distinct styles, which may be termed the historical and the autoptical, or that of the eye-witness. We can distinguish the latter from the former, partly by the occasional use of the first person plural, but chiefly by the circumstantiality of the narration; hence we can tell in almost every instance whether he was actually present or not. Now the whole of that part of St. Paul's history in which we know that he was in connection with Silas is purely historical, with the exception
of

of the portion of their travels between Troas and Philippi (Acts xvi. 8-40).

The plain and obvious inference is, that where the author writes autoptically he was actually present, that where he writes historically he was not.

It would be difficult to discover a more purely historical narrative than that portion of the Acts in which Silas is first noticed as having joined Paul, or a more purely autoptical one than that which occurs when the Apostle's party 'came down to Troas.' Nothing can be more simple than the explanation of this change of style; they found a fellow-labourer there, and that fellow-labourer was the author of the Acts, therefore Silas was not.

With regard to 'the first and second portions of the Acts,' the author remarks, that

'The historian never employs the first person, nor speaks as an eye-witness of the transactions. Yet in the earlier chapters, in which a peculiar prominence is given to the Apostle Peter, the precise information is such as must have been obtained by some one resident in Jerusalem, and in close connection with the Apostles.'

This is quite true, but proves nothing either way; for whether Silas or Luke was the author, we know from the narrative that he arrived at Jerusalem with Paul at Pentecost A.D. 58, and we find that he left Syria with the Apostles more than two years afterwards. We find, also, that he had personal intercourse with the Apostles (Acts xxi. 18). He was, therefore, in the most favourable position for collecting information. But we are told that Peter mentions Silvanus as with him at Antioch about A.D. 48, and we find him associated with Paul at a subsequent period; there is nothing in this to prove that, because he was with Peter in A.D. 48, he was with him at the much earlier period recorded in the first portion of the Acts; and I may add, that there is nothing in these early chapters to prove that he was personally present. The speeches of Peter are, indeed, very fully given; but it does not follow from this that the author heard them. It is in the narrative, and not in the speeches, that we can distinguish between the historical and the autoptical styles. The rule of ancient historians was, as much as possible, to give the *ipsissima verba* of the speakers; hence the reports of the speeches were generally inserted without alteration or abridgment. There is, in fact, nothing autoptical in the style of the author of the Acts till we come to Antioch. At this point the narrative becomes so circumstantial, that, although the author never uses the first person plural, or anything relating to himself, we cannot help thinking that it was here he first became associated with St. Paul. The journey from Antioch through Cyprus and Asia Minor,

Minor, along with Barnabas, is written very much in the style of an eye-witness; not, indeed, so much so as in the later portion of the Acts, where the author speaks in the first person. The author here must either have been actually present or, with an autoptical memoir before him, have entered more into detail than is usual in those parts of his narrative where we have reason to suppose he was not present, but wrote from the materials furnished by others.

Let us now consider the phenomena which, in the opinion of this author, are adverse to the supposition that Luke was the author:—

‘Every thing forbids our supposing that the Gospel of the Apostolic historian was the work of a mere compiler from written documents, a personal stranger to the memorable events which attended the foundation of the Christian church, and occupying the subordinate station of an amanuensis or simple attendant on St. Paul, who had joined him in the course of the apostolic travels. Tradition has associated the Evangelist with Paul, and has even fabulously represented him to have written his Gospel under that Apostle’s direction; whereas he tells us himself, in the dedication to Theophilus, why he undertook it.’—p. 332.

We know of no passage in the New Testament where Luke, the beloved friend and fellow-labourer of Paul, is represented as ‘a mere compiler, amanuensis, or a simple attendant upon St. Paul, who had joined him in the course of his apostolic travels.’ He did, indeed, join him in the course of this mission, but there is no reason to suppose that it was for the first time; on the contrary, the context leads us to suppose that when ‘they came down to Troas’ they expected to find him there; certainly there is nothing from which we can infer that he was not already the ‘fellow-labourer’ of the Apostle. After some remarks on the notices of Luke in the Epistles, the author continues:—

‘On leaving Greece for Syria there accompanied him into Asia Sopater of Berea, and of the Thessalonians Aristarchus and Secundus; Gaius of Derbe, and Timotheus, and of Asia Tychicus and Trophimus. These going before, says the historian, *tarried for us* at Troas. Now in this enumeration, is it likely that Silas should have been omitted had he not been the writer?’—p. 333.

It is perfectly clear that, if the name of either Silas or Luke had been included in the enumeration, it would have followed that one could not have written the Acts; for those enumerated formed a party who went before Paul and the author, and tarried for them at Troas. Any inference to be drawn from the omission of the name is more applicable to Luke than to Silas,
for

for the name of the latter appears to be always mentioned when he was present, Luke's never.

The total omission of the name of a colleague of such importance as St. Luke evidently was, as we gather from the notices of him in St. Paul's Epistles, is in fact one of the strongest arguments for the supposition that he was the author. It was no doubt not uncommon for ancient historians to mention their own names in cases where they were actors in the events they recorded, but there was this peculiarity in the works of the author of the Third Gospel and the Acts, that they were addressed to an individual, and it is not customary in such cases for the author to mention his name.

The author thus answers an objection to his hypothesis which we have already noticed, and which is also noticed in 'Eadie's Cyclopædia,' namely, that no particulars are given of the first journey of Paul and Silas till having gone through Syria and Cilicia he came to Derbe and Lystra, &c. The writer in the 'Cyclopædia' thinks the omission strange; we think it not only strange, but utterly unaccountable on any supposition but one, which is, that the author was not with Paul till the mission came down to Troas.

The objection which would alone have been fatal to this hypothesis, had there been no other, is thus answered:—

'But if Silas was *not* the author, in what respect would the omission be less strange? Could not Luke have learned the particulars of this journey from Paul or Timothy, as well as those of the previous missions of Paul and Barnabas? To call it an omission is presumptuously to find fault with the sacred narrative as not containing all that it ought to have comprised. In the case referred to, however, the alleged omission is easily explained, since, as the ground had been already travelled over before, we may reasonably suppose, that with the exception of Paul's adopting Timothy at Lystra, no special circumstance requiring to be recorded had occurred.'—p. 337.

In answer to this we would observe, that it is no presumption to endeavour to draw inferences from observed phenomena. Now one very strongly marked feature in the style of the author of the Acts is, that wherever we know with certainty, from the use of the first person plural, that he was an eye-witness, he becomes exceedingly circumstantial, his style at once changes from the historical to the autoptical. It may be very true that in the long journey which Paul and Silas made through Syria and Asia Minor, no special circumstance, with the exception of that stated, required to be recorded; but how can we account for the total absence of circumstantiality, in the first part of the journey, of a writer so observant and so circumstantial as is the writer of the Acts, if he was of the party; and how does it happen that a writer who only
records

records 'such special circumstances as require to be recorded,' and who never speaks in the first person plural in one portion of the narrative of the journey which Paul made with Silas, should in another portion, namely, that which relates to the progress from Troas to Philippi, and the events that happened there, relate so many circumstances which, historically speaking, did not require to be recorded, and how came this change of style to be precisely coincident with the change of persons?

The vision of St. Paul might have warranted the notice of what took place at Troas, as did the miracles at Philippi the mention of what took place there. But why are we told that the course from Philippi to Samothrace was a straight one? or why is Samothrace mentioned at all? For nothing is mentioned as having taken place there or at Neapolis, neither is it of historical importance to be told that, after remaining in Philippi certain days, 'they went out of the gate * on the Sabbath by a river side, where prayer was wont to be made, and sat down and spake unto the women which resorted thither; and a certain woman named Lydia, a seller of purple, of the city of Thyatira,' &c. Amongst the undesigned coincidences which stamp such an air of truth on the sacred writings, there is nothing more striking than the coincidence of the change of style with the change of person, which occurs at this particular part of the journey, so easily explained if we suppose the author joined at Troas, so utterly inexplicable on any other supposition.

The author remarks, that 'the account of the first journey of Paul and Barnabas is quite as full as the narrative of the journey of Paul and Silas into Macedonia after their leaving Troas, where Luke is supposed to have first joined them' (p. 337). The author certainly joined them there for the first time on this particular journey, but we have no reason to suppose that this was the first of his connection with St. Paul. We apprehend that it dates from a much earlier period, in short, from the time when he (St. Paul) first visited Antioch, and that the true cause of the circumstantiality of the account of the journey of Paul and Barnabas was that the author accompanied them, at least in the early part of it. We know that the Antiochean Christians did on certain occasions accompany the Apostle so far upon his missions. Thus when Paul and Barnabas proceeded from Antioch to Jerusalem, we are told that, 'being brought on their way by the Church they passed through Phenice and Samaria.' We do not, however, admit that the narrative of the journey in question 'is quite as full as that from Troas to Philippi.'

* ἐξῶ τῆς πόλεως, the reading of the first four uncial MSS.

As to the supposition that Silas is the brother, whose praise is in the Gospel throughout all the churches, the author has not favoured us with proofs, but rests the supposition that he was, upon vague conjecture;^b but if he were, it would be no proof that he accompanied Paul to Rome.

Speaking from internal evidence alone there are three conditions required to identify Luke or Silas as the author of the Acts, and of course of the Gospel, for no critic can entertain a doubt that they are the work of the same author.

The first of these is, that he was a fellow-labourer of Paul, the second, that he was with him at Rome, and the last, that he was a physician, for the precision and technicality of [his descriptions of diseases afford the strongest presumption that they proceed from the pen of a professional man. Now all these conditions are fulfilled in the person of Luke, only one of them in that of Silas.

We have already shown reasons why Silas could not be the author of the account of his own journey with Paul. What are the reasons adduced by this author which are adverse to the supposition that Luke was the author? We can discover none, except that, in the opinion of this author, St. Luke could not have used the term *us* in the following passage:—‘*We* immediately endeavoured to go into Macedonia, assuredly gathering that the Lord had called *us* to preach the Gospel to them.’ ‘We can only oppose our own opinion, which, we believe, is that of every critic except the present, that the ‘beloved’ friend and ‘fellow-labourer’ of Paul was perfectly entitled to use such language.

We have hitherto confined ourselves to the internal evidence, let us now look to the external evidence; that of Irenæus is thus easily disposed of:—

‘Irenæus (A.D. 178) is the earliest of the Fathers who gives a distinct account of the writers of the four Gospels; and his account is so full of inaccuracies as greatly to diminish our confidence in his means of information; since, as cited by Eusebius, he tells us Matthew wrote a Gospel for the Jews in their own language while Peter and Paul were preaching the Gospel at Rome and founding a church there; that Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, delivered to us in writing the things that had been preached by Peter; and Luke, the companion of Paul, put down in a book the Gospel preached by him (Paul).’—p. 345.

It is rather too much to throw overboard the testimony of Irenæus because he was a bad critic—the main fact mentioned by him that Luke was the author of the Gospel which passes under his name is not shaken because he gives an erroneous account of

^b Mr. Birks, in his ‘Supplement to the *Horæ Paulinæ*,’ supposes that Erastus is here meant.—p. 64.

the manner of its composition—the cause of the error on the part of Irenæus is obvious: Paul speaks of his Gospel; and as Luke was closely connected with Paul, we can easily understand how the ancients, who were but indifferent critics, should have imagined that such was the origin of the Gospel. It shows at all events that they were satisfied that this Gospel was written by Luke. In another passage Irenæus gives a more correct account of the origin of Luke's Gospel. He says—

‘Sic Apostoli simpliciter et nemini invidentes, quæ didicerant ipsi a Domino hæc omnibus tradebant. Sic igitur et Lucas nemine invidens ea quæ ab eis didicerat tradidit nobis sicut ipse testificatur dicens: Quemadmodum tradiderunt nobis qui ab initio contemplatores et ministri fuerunt verbi.’—*Adv. Hæres.*, l. iii. c. 14.

With regard to the authorship of the Acts this Father is equally explicit; he mentions him as Paul's ‘fellow-labourer,’ as ‘the beloved physician,’ and as the faithful friend who alone remained with him when Demas and others had forsaken him.

On the whole, there is no question of Biblical criticism attended with fewer difficulties than the name of the author of the third Gospel and of the Acts of the Apostles.

F. S.

TISCHENDORF'S SEPTUAGINT.

‘*Ἡ Παλαια Διαθήκη κατὰ τοὺς Ἑβδομηκοντα. Vetus Testamentum Græcè juxta LXX. Interpretes. Textum Vaticanum Romanum emendatius edidit, argumenta et locos Novi Testamenti parallelus notavit, omnem lectionis varietatem codicum vetustissimorum Alexandrini, Ephraemi Syri, Friderico-Augustani subjunxit, Commentationem isagogicam prætextuit* CONSTANTINUS TISCHENDORF, Theol. et Phil. Doctor, Theol. Professor. Lipsiæ, 1850. (2 vols. pp. lx, 682, and 588.)

THE Septuagint version must always be deemed of high value and interest by the Biblical student. It forms a needful part of every Biblical library; hence the number of editions in which it is multiplied continually. And yet we believe that there are but a limited number of persons who really *study* it; it appears to us used far more as a book of occasional reference than as one to be known and examined familiarly throughout. Hence, as it seems to us, have arisen not a few misconceptions; theories have been advanced which could scarcely have received a moment's attention, had it not been that those before whom such theories were

were placed were themselves imperfectly acquainted with the subject.

We believe that to form a just estimate of the Septuagint it ought to be thoroughly *studied*; this would be a safeguard against undue exaltation of its authority on the one hand, and too much depreciation of its worth on the other.

This version is an interesting monument of the providential care by which God so ordered that before the incarnation of our Lord there should be a version of His revealed truth in the language most current amongst the Gentiles; this version was often used by the inspired writers of the New Testament; it obtained a fixed place of authority in the eastern Church, so much so, that most of the ancient versions were taken from this translation, to the neglect of the authoritative Hebrew original. Amongst the Greeks it has always retained this exalted stand, so that whatever may be said of the honour given by the Latins to their Vulgate, the estimation in which the Greeks hold the LXX. is far greater.

The study of Greek in the west of Europe almost immediately followed the invention of printing; but there was a considerable interval between the revived study of Greek and any extensive effort to print books in that tongue; the efforts of the typefounders to express the Greek characters were but slow and awkward. The first printed edition of the LXX. was that contained in the Complutensian Polyglott (1514-1517). The editors have often been accused of altering the text so as to conform it as far as possible to the Hebrew text; however this may be, it is certain that the Complutensian text accords with the Hebrew far more than any other: the accuracy with which the editors followed their mss. might now be tested, as all the mss. of the LXX. which they used (with the exception of that which contained the Pentateuch) are now known to be preserved at Madrid. This text has not often been reprinted, and it never obtained any general use.

The *Aldine* text appeared at Venice in 1518; the editors of this appear to have followed such mss. as were in common circulation amongst the Greeks at that time. This text was often reprinted, and for about seventy years it was in almost exclusive use.

It had, however, been long known that a ms. was preserved in the Papal library of the Vatican containing the Greek Scriptures in characters of extreme antiquity: and in the belief that this MS. presented the genuine LXX. version, successful efforts were made to edit the text on its authority. The Roman edition, based on the Vatican ms., appeared in 1587. Since that time it may
be

be said that the earlier texts were neglected, and *this* became the '*Textus Receptus*' of the LXX.

In this respect the LXX. has fared better than most works of antiquity; for while they by slow degrees have been restored on the authority of ancient MSS. to a condition such as they were in at an early period, the Septuagint, on the contrary, so far as the editors correctly followed their copy, now came forth as it has been used and read in the time of Athanasius and Basil.

Some of the early reprints correct minute errors of the first edition of the Vatican text, but with these few trifling exceptions this has been the basis of the LXX. in common use.

The Alexandrian MS. was indeed used by Grabe as the authority of his edition (1707-1720), but this text never at all supplanted the Vatican. Indeed Grabe deserted his MS. very frequently to introduce his own emendations, or readings which he considered preferable; the notes in which these changes were to have been explained and justified never appeared in consequence of the death of the learned editor. Grabe also endeavoured as far as possible to restore the additions which Origen had made from the other Greek versions.

Since the publication of the Alexandrian text its variations from the Vatican have become almost a necessary supplement to every good edition of the latter; and this addition is the extent, generally speaking, to which textual criticism has been applied to the LXX. Of the collations instituted by Holmes we shall have occasion to speak presently.

In the edition before us, Tischendorf has evidently sought to give such a text as shall be suitable for general use: he gives the Vatican text, corrected as to many points in which the Roman editors pointed out errata, or in which there was something undoubtedly demanding amendment. In the Prolegomena all these corrections are minutely specified.

At the foot of each page are given all the important variations of the Alexandrian MS. Besides the readings of this MS., he has also given those of two others, the Codex Friderico-Augustanus, and the Codex Ephraemi. The former of these MSS. was discovered by Tischendorf himself (who also published it in a lithographed facsimile), and in this edition he has made its readings generally available. The part of the Old Testament contained in this MS. is, however, unhappily but small—a portion of 1 Chron., a fragment of Ezra, the books of Nehemiah and Esther, and about forty chapters of Jeremiah, with a fragment of the Lamentations, and another of the Apocryphal book of Tobit.

The text of the Old Testament fragments of the Codex Ephraemi

Ephraemi had been published by Tischendorf subsequently to those of the New Testament, from the same MS. In the Old Testament they contain far less than in the New; parts of Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, and of the apocryphal books of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus.

Thus the additions made in this edition to the critical apparatus for the LXX. are not great in quantity, although highly valuable as far as they go. As they are we thankfully accept them. Nor do we overlook the care which Tischendorf has taken in revising the accentuation, punctuation, &c., of his edition; in some minutiae we might differ from him, but the evident care bestowed gives a value to his work.

The examination of this edition leads us to inquire how could the LXX. be most usefully edited in the present state of our critical knowledge? In the first place *some* use ought to be made of the immense and fatiguing store of various readings found in the tomes of Holmes and his successor Parsons. The object proposed by Holmes was indeed a worthy one—the collation of all known MS. of the LXX. was a work worthy of the effort of a critic. But the difficulties evidently bore heavily on the attention of the editor, and hence the readings are but little arranged—difficult to use, and leading to no definite result. Besides all this, the comparative neglect of some of the more important documents is surprising; thus it is difficult to see why the readings of the Codex Alexandrinus are commonly given, not at the head of the MS. authorities, but obscurely amongst the printed editions; and this is not the worst, for the Alexandrian readings are often not to be found at all, or else they are so inaccurately stated as utterly to mislead. These defects in the part of the work edited by Holmes himself are increased in many ways in the part superintended by Parsons after his death.

But still, amongst the various readings there is one class worthy of especial notice—those of the uncial MSS., and we believe that good service would be rendered to the criticism of the LXX. if these, at least, were rescued from the obscurity to which they are now consigned. There are difficulties to be encountered—some of these uncial MSS. are not so distinguished by Holmes and Parsons, and thus the whole mass of citations and figures must be read through to select them,—a labour from which many a practised eye might shrink. The Alexandrian readings should be most carefully added, and there should also be subjoined the readings of the Greek MS. of the Psalms (in Roman letters), published by Bianchini (*Vindiciæ*). These authorities, with the readings of the MSS. given by Tischendorf, would form critical apparatus of a most valuable kind. The student would thus have
before

before him in a condensed form the most important data for the revision of the text of the LXX.

We have already spoken of the Vatican editors not having followed their mss. in all respects with exactitude. This is proved by the various readings in Holmes's edition, for which, in many books, the Vatican ms. was collated; thus such a selection of various readings as that of which we have spoken would have the additional value of enabling often to correct the text of the Roman edition by means of the ms. on which it is based.

It has been the common practice of editors to omit the genuine LXX. of Daniel (even since its discovery), so that Theodotion's takes its place in all the editions with which we are acquainted, with the single exception of Holmes's. Surely this ought not to be continued; the real LXX. of Daniel should be reprinted, incorrect as it is, *as well as* the more accurate translation of Theodotion, which the Church substituted for it at so early a period.

In the Apocryphal books, also, the *fourth* of Maccabees does not appear in reprints of the Vatican text; this can only arise from an adherence to the Roman edition, in which but three are inserted: it is in vain to plead here the Vatican *manuscript*, as that is defective in all the books of Maccabees. The fourth deserves a place in the Apocryphal literature as much as the third.

It may be thought that we are indulging rather in *wishes* as to an edition of the LXX. than in reasonable *expectations*; we may, however, say that we do look forward to the publication of such an edition at no distant period; we may then, for the first time, see the stores in the volumes of Holmes and Parsons turned to some practical utility.

Tischendorf, in his Prolegomena, refers to a recent work by a Greek named Oiconomos, in which the Divine authority of the LXX. is upheld. This leads us back to a subject which has been much discussed. It has been said, that, because the New Testament often uses the LXX. version, therefore it canonizes it as a whole; that this is to us a Divine sanction of the work as such; and on these grounds it has been ranked as highly as the Hebrew original, or even *more* highly by some.

On the other hand, it has been well urged that the writers of the New Testament often depart widely from the LXX., so that might seem to be so far a reprobation of the version; and therefore the authority of the New Testament must not be pleaded one whit further than with regard to the texts in which the reading of the LXX. is either used or rejected. Besides all this, the number of passages in which the LXX. translators show that their own doctrinal ideas have biassed their version, are so consi-

derable that it is extravagant to imagine that it can possess any Divine authority.

The transmission of this version to us from the early church has sometimes been advanced as a proof of its canonical authority. It has been said, Surely we ought to prefer the Greek text, which the church has transmitted, to the Hebrew text, which has only come through the unbelieving *Jews*. But if the argument be *consistently* maintained, what could we say to the conduct of the church in rejecting the LXX. version of Daniel, and adopting in its stead that of the Ebionite Theodotion? This does not savour much of the early church having strongly held the Divine authority of the LXX. And further, whence did the early church receive this version? From the *Jews*; that very same nation has transmitted to us both the Greek translation and the Hebrew original. And we need not suppose that the early church was wholly and entirely devoid of the Hebrew text. In the second century (to say nothing of the apostolic age), we find Melito of Sardis diligently inquiring into the books of the Old Testament in Hebrew; in the third century, we find Origen acquainted with the Hebrew original; and in the fourth century there was Jerome, whose knowledge of Hebrew and labours in executing his Latin version, deserve to be highly estimated. The old Syriac version, too, of the Old Testament, made direct from the Hebrew, belongs to the early period of the church.

Thus it cannot be truly said that the church has possessed the Greek text in opposition to the Hebrew; it received *both* from the Jews ('to whom were committed the oracles of God'), although of course it made more use of that which was vernacular to a great portion of it, than of that which was in a tongue so little known. It is a singular fact, that the Hebrew text, always in the hands of the Jews, supplies far more evidence of the Godhead of the Messiah, and other material points of Christian verity, than does the LXX.

It must not be overlooked, that at a very early period, discrepancies were noticed between the Hebrew and LXX.; in the Prologue to Ecclesiasticus this is plainly pointed out.

Some advocates for the *authority* of the LXX. have alleged, that, had it not been for this version, we should really possess no knowledge of the Hebrew text; that, had not this translation been made, we should have been thoroughly ignorant of Hebrew! A most futile assertion! The LXX. may be *one* source of Hebrew lexicography, but even in this it ranks *far lower* than the version of Jerome.

In these remarks on the extravagant claims advanced in favour of the LXX., we have no desire to depreciate that version: it is
very

very valuable in its place, and it is only the demands of its incautious advocates that make it needful to discuss the point.

The LXX. is a translation venerable for its antiquities, important as the vehicle of revealed truth for many ages, and amongst wide-spread nations ; and of particular interest, from the use made of it in the New Testament. The apostles most usually quote it, and thus is shown the honour which God can put on an honestly made version, in spite of its imperfections. When the LXX. gives the sense near enough for the matter in hand, it is commonly quoted, even though, in some minute particulars, the rendering of the passages in question may not be very accurate.

There are many topics of interest connected with the LXX. on which we have no present occasion to speak ; they are not, however, to be overlooked ; one of the more important of these is, How far do we possess the LXX. as it existed prior to the labours of Origen, and how far have his emendations affected the text which we now have ?

M. N. O.

THE BARDS OF THE BIBLE.

The Bards of the Bible. By GEORGE GILFILLAN. Edinburgh : James Hogg. London : Groombridge and Sons.

It is somewhat surprising that so few of those whose professional studies necessarily bring them into close contact with the subject, should devote some part of their time and talents to the exposition of the *literary* characteristics of Scripture. It cannot be because that branch of study is uninteresting, for all who have given it their attention will bear us out in saying that the mere litterateur will not find another so fascinating in the whole range of the belles lettres. Nor can it be accounted for on the ground that it is 'thin sown with aught of profit,' for surely no divine—believing, as of course he does, in the superhuman origin of the Bible—can hold that anything tending to throw light on its pages, to elucidate its beauties and display its grandeurs, can be pronounced void of use or advantage. And yet the fact is incontrovertible, that seldom has a book in the world had its literary merits so unjustly (it would almost seem studiously) overlooked as the Book of books. Gigantic intellects have plied their energies in attempting to fathom its doctrinal teachings, and tomes innumerable attest how unweariedly they have toiled ; but, looking at it from an artistic point of view, what an insignificant appearance do its illustrators make when compared with the numbers who, on account of similar services rendered to our Homers, and Shakspeares,

Shakespeares, and Miltons, have won the grateful approbation of mankind. Take away Lowth, and Horsley, and a few more honourable British and continental names, and the remaining handful, thin and scanty as the hairs on the head of Thersites, will prove a most eloquent testimony against this painful and disheartening state of things. One reason for this may, perhaps, be found in the mortifying aversion which many good people exhibit towards the person who ventures to institute comparisons between the Scripture writers. Devoutly impressed with the belief that the Bible is the transcript of the Eternal Mind, and as such worthy of profoundest veneration, they feel shocked at any attempt, as it appears to them, to degrade the 'holy men who spake, moved by the Holy Ghost,' to a level with uninspired writers, and have an idea that any criticism on their different styles is little other than profane. This being a good and a commendable feeling in the main, though carried to undue limits, we would wish to respect it. Far be it from us to make such sentiments the object of mirth and ridicule. But as far be it from us to pass unblamed what we deem a positively injurious jealousy for the fame of the authors of the Bible. We think it savours too much of a timorous want of faith in its Great Author to act as if his was the only Book on whose literary excellencies the less said the better; and sure are we no more effective plan than this could be devised for strengthening the sceptic in his virulent hatred to Revelation. For if Israel distrusts the ark of Jehovah, can we expect to see the Philistines bowing reverently before it? To such, then, we would say—Strive to free yourself from these groundless fears. You believe that the Bible, with its doctrines and its laws, is the gift of God to man; believe also that whatever comes from Him the more closely it is scrutinised will prove in every respect the more faultless, the more wonderful, the more worthy of the All-Perfect One. By your unmanly, unchristian alarm for the Bible when in the hands of its warmest friends, you are giving occasion to the enemies of that blessed Book to blaspheme. An Emerson in our day (no doubt very smartly) has likened the heavenly utterances of the prophets to 'screams,' and a Robert William Mackay, in the pompous tone of Sir Oracle, has pronounced the whole Jewish nation, lawgiver, historians, poets, prophets and all, to have been 'hopelessly illiterate.' Beware lest they be emboldened, in their arrogant self-sufficiency, by the perturbation you manifest when your fellow-christians take the readiest method to stop the mouths of such gainsayers, and to make them feel, if not acknowledge, that these 'illiterate' Jews—these contemptible 'screamers'—are seated on a height to which they dare never soar.

Feeling

Feeling deeply, as we do, the deficiency in our language of standard works in that department of biblical literature, indicated above, it was with no ordinary pleasure we heard, more than twelve months ago, that the Rev. George Gilfillan, of Dundee, was busy preparing a volume of criticisms on the 'Bards of the Bible.' From what we knew of that gentleman through the medium of his 'Galleries of Literary Portraits,' we felt confident that he would not fail to give to the world something worthy alike of his own established reputation and of his lofty theme. A theme more congenial to his peculiar powers could scarcely be thought of. He possesses immense vigour of imagination, and a keen relish for poetic beauty; with a command of language rarely surpassed, he combines a liking for metaphor and simile often to an extravagant degree,—

'He cannot ope
His mouth but out there flies a trope;'

and, moreover, his accomplished mind is thoroughly imbued with the love of evangelical truth. These being his mental characteristics, and the 'Bards of the Bible' his subject-matter, it was only reasonable to expect that Mr. Gilfillan would accomplish greater deeds than he had ever previously done. And the result has proved that such expectations were well-founded. The volume before us, notwithstanding its many and grievous defects, *has* surpassed all his former achievements, and, without a doubt, will rank as one of the most brilliant, if scarcely the solidest, contributions to biblical literature that Britain has produced for many a year. What Mr. Gilfillan's intentions in composing the volume were are thus explained in the preface. 'In order that the book may be tried by its own pretensions, the author deems it necessary to premise, that, while containing much literary criticism, and a considerable portion of biographical and religious matter, and while meant to develop indirectly a subsidiary argument for the truth and divinity of the Bible, its main ambition is to be a prose poem, or hymn, in honour of the poetry and poets of the inspired volume, although, as the reader will perceive, he has occasionally diverged into the analysis of Scripture characters, and more rarely into cognate fields of literature or of speculation.' We will endeavour to act upon Mr. Gilfillan's hint, and 'try the book by its own pretensions,' at the same time reserving the privilege, should we think proper, of following him whenever he diverges into any 'cognate field of literature or speculation.' And, first of all, that the reader may more readily comprehend what Mr. Gilfillan means when he speaks of 'Hebrew poetry,' we will quote his arrangement thereof as laid down in Chapter III. That arrangement

arrangement consists of two general heads, viz. Song and Poetic Statement; these, again, having their subdivisions as follows:—

I. SONG.

Exulting—in odes of triumph—Psalm cl.
 Insulting—in strains of irony and invective—Psalm cix.
 Mourning—over calamities—Psalm lxxi.; Lamentations.
 Worshipping—God—Psalm civ.
 Loving—in friendly or amatory songs—Psalm xlv.
 Reflecting—in gnomic or sententious strains—Psalm cxxxix.;
 Proverbs.
 Interchanging—in the varied persons and parts of the simple
 drama—Job and Song.
 Wildly—luxuriating—as in Psalm vii.; Habakkuk iii.
 Narrating—the past deeds of God to Israel, the simple epic—
 Psalm lxxviii.; Exodus, &c.
 Predicting—the future history of the Church and the World—
 Prophetic Writings.

II. POETICAL STATEMENT—or *Statement*,

1st—Of Poetic Facts (Creation, &c.).
 2nd—Of Poetic Doctrines (God's Spirituality).
 3rd—Of Poetic Sentiments, with or without figurative language
 (Golden Rule, &c.).
 4th—Of Poetic Symbols (in Zechariah, Revelation, &c.).

This division—an odd one we presume to think—Mr. Gilfillan, while professing his intention not to abide strictly by it in his after chapters, maintains to be 'comprehensive and simple.' Its comprehensiveness we are in no wise disposed to question, but that it has simplicity to recommend it is what cannot be admitted. It is much more complex than either the arrangement of Lowth or Ewald, and, besides, it creates an inextricable confusion between these two altogether diverse things, Poetry and Prose. It will not do for Mr. Gilfillan to assure us that 'the simple narrations of Ezra and Nehemiah' are 'genuinely poetic.' If we grant this, what should hinder us from pronouncing Xenophon's *Anabasis* to be as 'genuinely poetic' as Hesiod's 'Works and Days,' or Macaulay's *History* as 'genuinely poetic' as the *Paradise Lost*? For observe, these narrations are not rendered 'genuinely poetic,' by the fact that they are inspired narrations, but by the fact that they contain within them a great deal of poetic beauty. We fall back on our former illustration, and say that—keeping out of view its inspiration as having no concernment with the present dispute—while we admit the narration of the 'Uprising' of the Hebrew captives from Babylon to be full of poetic

poetic beauty, candour compels us to make the same admission regarding the *Anabasis* of Xenophon; and we thus find ourselves brought to the inevitable conclusion, that if the one be 'poetry,' the other is poetry too. Mr. Gilfillan, and those who think with him, will perhaps inform us that we are evidently cursed with a prosaic soul, and have been industriously labouring to make good our right and title to the Carlyleian epithet of 'Dryasdust.' Be it so: we are content to hold with Bishop Lowth (for whose invaluable services we are sorry to see Mr. Gilfillan manifests little gratitude), that metrical structure and poetical style are two things very requisite to a composition before its claims to rank as 'poetry' can be recognised. The view we have been combating runs as a fatal flaw throughout our author's estimate of Biblical Poetry, but we have almost magnanimity enough to forgive him on that account, when to it we owe so many eloquent discouragements on the poetry of the Pentateuch and of the Historical Books. Here, for example, is his sketch of Moses, as given at the close of his fourth chapter:—

'He was the loneliest of men: lonely in his flight from Egypt—lonely while herding his flock in the wilderness—lonely while climbing Mount Sinai—lonely on the summit, and lonely while descending the sides of the hill—lonely in his death, and lonely in his burial. Even while mingling with the multitude of Israel, he remained secluded and alone. As the glory which shone on his face insulated him for a time from men, so did all his life his majestic nature. He was among men, but not of them. Stern incarnation of the anger of Omnipotence, thy congenial companions were not Aaron, nor Joshua, nor Zipporah, but the rocks and caves of Horeb, the fiery pillar, the bush burning, the visible glory of the sanctuary, the lightning-wreaths round Sinai's sullen brow, and all other red symbols of Jehovah's presence! With such, like a kindred fire, upon one funeral pile, didst thou gloomily embrace and hold still communion! Shade of power not yet perished—sole lord of millions still wielding the two tables as the sceptres of thy extant sovereignty, with thy face flashing back the splendours of the Divine eye, and seeming to descend evermore thy "Thunder-hill of Fear"—it is with a feeling of awful reverence that we bid thee farewell!'

Next we quote the observations with which he concludes his notice of Balaam, 'the first godless poet':—

'Genius has indeed a hard task to perform when she turns, or seeks to turn, against God. In proportion to the resemblance she bears him, is the misery of the rebellion. It is not the clay rising against the potter—it is the sunbeam against the sun. But here, too, we find righteous compensation. Sometimes the parricidal power is palsied in the blow. Thus, Paine found the strong right hand which, in the "Rights of Man," had coped with Burke, shivered, when in the "Age of

of Reason" it touched the Ark of the Lord. Sometimes, with the blasphemy of the strain, there is blended a wild beauty, or else a mournful discontent, which serves to carry off or to neutralize the evil effect. Shelley, for instance, has made few converts; a system which kept him so miserable cannot make others happy or hopeful—and you cry besides, that very beauty and love of which he raves are vague abstractions, till condensed into a *form*. Others, again, lapped generally in the enjoyment or dream of a sensual paradise, which is often disturbed by the feeling or the fear of a sensuous hell, sometimes through their dream chant fragments of psalms, snatches of holy melodies learned in childhood; or, awakening outright, feel a power over them, compelling them to utter the truth of heaven in strains which had too often fanned by turn every evil passion of earth; and, behold, a Burns and Byron, as well as a Saul and a Balaam, are among the prophets. Does their genius thus exercised seem strange as a parable in the mouth of fools? How stranger far to superior beings must be the spectacle of *any* species of genius revolting against its own higher nature in revolting against its God!—p. 79.

Skiping over his admirable chapter on the Book of Job (the interminable disputes concerning the authorship of which Mr. Gilfillan for ever settles in one oracular sentence—'it was not Moses'), we find him endeavouring to analyse the character of David:—

'A noble nature, stung before its sin, and seared before its time, contending between the whirlpool of passion and the strong still impulses of poetry and faith, ruling all spirits except *his own*, and yet for ever seeking to regulate it, too, sincere in *all* things—in sin and in repentance—but sincerest in repentance—often neglecting the special precept, but ever loving the general tenor of the law, unconciliated to his age or circumstances, and yet always striving after such a reconciliation, harassed by early grief, great temptations, terrible trial in advanced life, and views necessarily dim and imperfect—David nevertheless, retained to the last his heart, his intellect, his simplicity, his devotion—above all, his sincerity—loved his God, saw from afar off his Redeemer; and let the man who is "without sin" among his detractors cast the first stone. His character is *chequered*, but the stripes outnumber the stains, and the streaks of light outnumber both. In his life there is no lurking place—all is plain: the heights are mountains—"the hills of holiness," where a free spirit walks abroad in singing robes; the valleys are depths, out of which you hear the voice of a prostrate penitent pleading for mercy, but nothing is, or can be, concealed, since it is God's face which shows both the lights and shadows of the scene. David, if not the greatest or best of inspired men, was certainly one of the most extraordinary. You must try him, not indeed by divine or angelic comparison; but if there be any allowance for the aberrations of a tortured, childlike, devout son of genius—if the nobler beasts of the wilderness themselves will obey a law, and observe a chronology, and follow a path of their own, then let the wanderer of Adullam

Adullam be permitted to enter or to leave his cave at his own time, and in his own way, seeing that his wanderings were never intended for a map to others, and that those who follow are sure to find that they are aught but ways of pleasantness or of peace to them.'—p. 93.

This is very well said, but do our readers find it to tally in every respect with their conceptions of 'the man after God's own heart'—'*my servant David*'?

It is not easy to resist the temptations to extract many of the splendid passages scattered throughout the volume. With a lavish hand Mr. Gilfillan showers them around him as he goes; sometimes in the form of short, but generally just, analyses of character—sometimes as highly wrought descriptive scenes, now 'weaving a garland of beauty' for some stern moral deducible from the subject, and anon starting aside from his path into some 'cognate field of literature,' which he seldom leaves till he has sprinkled and adorned it with many brilliant gems from his fancy's teeming mine. Whatever his subject be, whether the 'one long rapture' of Isaiah, that 'Titan among a tribe of Titans'—'Ezekiel's rough and rapid vehemence, like a red torrent from the hills seeking the lake of Galilee in the day of storm—David's high gusts of lyric enthusiasm, dying away into the low wailings of penitential sorrow—Daniel's awful allegory,' or the 'piled and enthroned thunders' of John—the discourse rarely fails to prove worthy of the text. It would give us pleasure to quote many of these. By so doing we might enable the reader to form an idea of Mr. Gilfillan's extraordinary command of his mother-tongue; of his power as a word-painter; of the gorgeous imagination where-with he has been gifted; of his acute critical discernment; of his perfect familiarity with the literature of many ages and of many lands; all of which, when combined so admirably, fit him to descant on sacred song. But our narrowing space warns us to forbear, and only leaves it in our power to urge upon our readers to procure the volume and seek that satisfaction for themselves.

So far as we have gone, we have scarcely used other language than that of hearty commendation; we would be borne with if for a little we assume the tone of admonition. Mr. Gilfillan has abstained (very properly, we think,) from meddling with the 'vexatious question of verbal inspiration;' but was it one whit more obligatory on him to obtrude so prominently his pre-Millennarian opinions? We cannot see why, in a work of this nature, any question so fertile in controversy as that of the Second Advent should be again and again dragged forward to the reader's notice. If Mr. Gilfillan felt constrained to make a public confession of his faith on this point, we humbly think he might have relieved his conscience and not displeased even his pre-

pre-Millennarian readers, by saying a great deal less thereon than he has chosen to do. As it is, he has not added one new argument to those already current, nor thrown a single ray of light more athwart the gloom that overhangs this mighty event; no, not even though he has pressed a somewhat ungainly allegory into the service.*

And what shall we say of his style? After the praises we have bestowed on his fluency and eloquence of speech, it may seem strange to turn round and make the same topic the ground of censure. But so grievous are Mr. Gilfillan's faults in this respect, and so damaging are they to his own fame, that we cannot suffer the present opportunity to pass without endeavouring to convince him of his error. Haste, and a uniform tendency to sacrifice everything to *effect*, may be called the Scylla and Charybdis by which Mr. Gilfillan is ever prone to be engulfed. Respecting the first, he ought to know that it is due both to himself, and to his readers, to shun it; and if he wishes his writings to be something more than ephemeral, he must shun it, otherwise he will find that his hold of that immortality of fame which spurs on 'the clear spirit to scorn delights and live laborious days,' is very slight indeed. Were it a newspaper article, or a dashing critique on some 'bundle of books' for Hogg's 'Weekly Instructor,' we could not object to quick despatch in its preparation. But we can hardly exercise the same leniency when there are too many manifestations of the same expeditious system of composition in a work whose 'main ambition is to be a prose poem in honour of the poetry and poets of the inspired volume.' We know it may be pleaded that his professional avocations (which we are glad to hear Mr. Gilfillan does not neglect), and his other literary engagements, render it impossible for him to bestow that nice finish on his more ambitious productions so necessary to enable them to resist the corroding teeth of time. To remedy this we would not counsel him to curtail the labours of his pastoral charge, but we would strenuously advise him to write less with an eye to the fleeting hour, and to devote the time so spent, and the talents (shall we say?) so frittered away, to the preparation of works which may win for him the proud recompense of the applause of generations to come.

So much for the one defect in Mr. Gilfillan's composition; the

* Mr. Gilfillan tells us that, if spared, he means to develop his views of the reconciliation of man to God at some future period, 'probably in a fictitious form.' We will not utter any rash prophecy; but, if the Dream in his eighteenth chapter is a fair specimen of his powers in this department of literature, we confess that we entertain serious misgivings as to the wisdom of his intended effort, and rather fear that in this his *Kîpes* have not decreed him to excel.

other,

other, though no less damaging, may be disposed of in briefer terms. What we have charged him with is an evident hankering after effect in all that comes from his pen. He may be altogether unconscious of its existence, and perhaps it is inseparable to the glowing ardour of his temperament. However that may be, it betrays him oftener than his warmest admirers can avoid noticing, into a ludicrously inflated manner of handling the meanest subjects. With him, 'it never rains but it pours;' and the most bombastic strains of the poet of the Seasons do many times really seem tame and sober when placed in comparison with our author's prose. Worse still, it not seldom leads him to an unwarrantable licence of speech while discoursing of grave and lofty matters which cannot fail to shock the serious mind. That 'divine simplicity' which Cowper desiderates 'in him who handles things divine,' is a grace which Mr. Gilfillan has yet to acquire; an assertion the impartial reader will find abundantly substantiated in the volume itself. Nor can we refrain from commenting on his unclerical contempt for creeds and confessions, for lectures and essays on the evidences, for 'agencies' and (evangelical or sabbath?) 'alliances,' and his unfair estimate of them as means for strengthening the bulwarks and diffusing the benign influences of our religion. Mr. Gilfillan likens the Church in her present position to that of the Grecian host, when Achilles lay inactive 'beside his tents and his ships,' and finds his only comfort amid 'increasing dangers and multiplying foes,' in the hope that soon *our* Achilles shall 'no more be silent, but speak out,' shall lift his—

'Bow, his thunder, his Almighty arms.'

Shall—

'take unto him his great power and reign.'

True; when He appears (whatever 'his appearing' may mean), then indeed the tide of battle will be straightway turned and the victory won, and the might of the hostile legions broken for ever. But meanwhile we must obey the command of our Great Captain, and put on 'the *panoply* of God, that we may be able to withstand in the evil day, and, *having done all*, to stand.' Far from fretting at the little apparent success attending our toils, far from becoming fainthearted at the imposing array drawn out against us, let us rather thank God and take courage, and, with Psalm xli. 1, for our warcry, be found ever and anon plunging into the thick of the conflict, as if on our individual exertions depended the issue of the day. Had the well-greaved Achaians given way to utter despondency because Achilles tarried long at his fleet; had they shrunk from doing what lay in their power because his chariot-wheels

wheels delayed their coming; had they not strained every nerve, and even in disastrous, albeit temporary, defeat, evidenced their high-mettled bravery, would the walls of 'windswept' Ilium ever have lain level with the ground?

But we are unwilling to part company with Mr. Gilfillan in the tone and language of animadversion. We feel truly grateful for the pleasure we have derived from the perusal of his work, and would express our sincere wish that he may be long spared to prove an honour and a benefactor to the literary world. His next undertaking, we trust, will exhibit no symptoms of degenerating powers, will have all the beauties and none of the faults of the one we have been reviewing, whether his theme be the literature of our own land, or (as we would certainly desire it)—

'Zion's songs, to all true tastes excelling.'

I.

RECONSIDERED TEXTS.

Nos. III. and IV.

'By whom also He made the worlds (*καὶ τοὺς αἰῶνας ἐποίησεν*).—Heb. i. 2.

'Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed (*καταρτισθαι τοὺς αἰῶνας*) by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear (*εἰς τὸ μὴ ἐκ φαινομένων τὰ βλεπόμενα γυγόναι*).—Heb. xi. 3.

As the designation *κόσμος* (*order, arrangement, beauty*), the word commonly employed to express '*the world*' considered as a material creation, (*vide* Heb. iv. 3; ix. 26; x. 5, &c.), aptly expresses the beautiful and orderly arrangement of its several parts;^a so, considered as a period of duration, or as a series of connected events, it may, with an equally significant propriety, be spoken of as an *αἰών* (*age, or period*).—*vide* Matt. xii. 32; xiii. 40, 49; xxiv. 3; 2 Tim. iv. 10, &c., or *αἰῶνες* (*periods*), as in the passage before us.

There can, however, be but little doubt that *originally* the word *αἰών*, as applied to the world, was so applied to it considered *simply as a period of duration, or as a series of events*, as in the texts above referred to; though eventually the material world appears to have been so denominated irrespectively altogether of its periods, or ages, or events. The distinction between the world, considered with reference to its materialism, and the world con-

^a 'Quem κόσμον Græci nomine ornamenti appellaverunt, eum nos a perfecta absolutâque elegantia mundum.'—Plin., *Nat. Hist.* ii. 3.

sidered

sidered with reference to its periods. was of too delicate a kind to be always very rigidly observed.^b Etymological reasons are soon either disregarded or forgotten.

Without presuming, therefore, to deny that the world's original creation is perhaps referred to in the two texts now about to be considered, yet as it is a truth clearly revealed in other portions of God's Word, that God is Creator not only of the world's materialism, but that it is by His will that periods and events successively arise and disappear; as the strict, primary, and proper meaning of *αἰών* is an age or period; as it is clear that the word when applied to the world is so applied only metonymically; and as there is no instance of the word being employed in the plural number to denote the *τὰ πάντα* of the visible creation, prior to the time of the Rabbinites; it may be doubted whether a translation which would lead us to suppose that the fact of a past material creation is primarily or alone intended, can be regarded as correct.

Upon these grounds I would, in the first place, prefer to translate the word *αἰῶνες* in these texts 'periods' or 'ages,' rather than 'worlds.' Various commentators and lexicographers have already so translated it; so that, so far as regards the translation of this word, I am proposing nothing new. Their translation, however, has never been very generally adopted; chiefly, it would seem, because of its supposed incongruity with the other phrases of these two verses; and because its advocates (grounding their translation merely or mainly on the fact that 'periods' or 'ages' is the strict and proper meaning of the word *αἰῶνες*) have not endeavoured to disprove the inconsistency alleged.

My object in the present paper, therefore, will be, not to prove that the word is susceptible of being so translated, (for that it is so is undisputed,) but to endeavour to uphold the consistency of such translation with the exigencies of the context. For if it can be shown that these objections to the reception of *αἰῶνες* in its ordinary sense (viz., as signifying 'ages' or 'periods') are groundless; and if it should yet further appear that the declaration contained in the second of these passages, (viz., 'so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear') is perhaps more applicable to a series of connected events, *i. e.*, to ages, or periods, than to the materialism of the created world, we certainly are bound to receive the word *αἰῶνες* rather in its usual

^b Vid. Buxtorf's *Lexicon Rabbin.*, Fesselii *Adversar.* p. 199, and Carpzov. *in loc.* See also the Apocryphal books of the Wisdom of Solomon, xiii. 9, xiv. 6; Eccles. xxxviii. 34, xliii. 6. In the Latin version (the Greek original being lost) of the second book of Esdras the word *seculum* (age), for *mundus* (the world), is also of frequent occurrence.—Vide, *e. g.*, ch. iii. 9; iv. 24; v. 44, 49; ix. 13, 18, &c. &c.

and admitted sense, than in one which, if not doubtful, is, to say the least, unusual.

So notorious is it that '*periods*' or '*ages*' is the strict and proper meaning of the word, that there can, I think, be no doubt that the prevalent translation has been adopted chiefly upon rhetorical grounds. Thus Macknight, who favours the common translation, is of opinion that the clause (xi. 3), 'So that things which are seen were not *made* of things which do appear,' clearly determines the signification of the word in these two verses, as signifying *the material world*. Stuart is influenced by a like consideration: 'Theodoret,' he says, 'explains the word as meaning *ages*; and so others have since done: but what is the sense of the assertion that God *made* the *ages* by his Son?'

Let us then first turn to the expression that God '*made the ages* by his Son.' Is it not notorious that the Greek verb ποίέω (*to make*) is capable of a much greater latitude of application than our own '*to make*?' In cases in which we should never think of using its so-called English equivalent, there we find ποίέω freely employed. Hence, in Greek it is quite legitimate to say, '*to make redemption*' (Luke i. 68); '*to make an avenging of*' (Luke xviii. 8); '*to make put out*' (Joh. xvi. 2); '*to make cast out*' (Acts vii. 19); '*to make a lying in wait*' (Acts xxv. 3); '*to make a purpose*' (Eph. iii. 11), and the like; which phrases are by our English translators respectively rendered, '*to redeem*,' '*to avenge*,' '*to put out*,' '*to cast out*,' '*to lie in wait*,' '*to purpose*;' (such translations being most consonant to our English modes of expression, as those above given are most agreeable to Greek usage;) and so commonly is the Greek verb used in the sense of '*to cause to be*,' that it is needless to go beyond the pages of the New Testament for proofs. Of this, such phrases as, '*to make fruit*' (Luke xix. 9; Rev. xxii. 2); '*to make divisions*' (Rom. xvi. 17); '*to make miracles*' (Acts xix. 11; Rev. xix. 20); '*to make joy*' (Acts xv. 3); may be cited as examples. Surely, then, it is legitimate to say of Him, according to whose will and working it is that ages successively exist and disappear, that He is the *maker* of them; and the propriety or impropriety of the expression '*to make the ages*' becomes simply a question of idiom. If the expression be not agreeable to *English* phraseology, the above analogous expressions are sufficient to show that it is not inconsistent with *Greek* phrase.

The employment of a past tense, in speaking of the formation of these *aiōves*, whether that tense be an aorist, as in the first of these two verses, or a perfect, as in the second, determines nothing with reference to the point at issue. Either of these tenses would
equally

equally apply to the creation of the world, or to the determination of its ages and events; the making of the ages, so far as the will and purpose of God are concerned, being as much a past and finished act (though, as respects the development and actual execution of that will, an act in progress) as the creation of the world's materialism. Coeval with the creation of the world was the commencement of its periods. They were determined from the beginning, and began from the beginning. Those periods, therefore, though as yet in progress, may with the strictest propriety be said to have been made at and from the beginning, when the world was first created, and its periods first began.

In like manner all the expressions of the second of these two verses are to the full as applicable to the periods of the world's history as to the materialism of its creation. 'Periods' or 'ages' may, with as much propriety, be said to have been 'framed' or 'fashioned' as matter. If, as applied to the act of the world's creation, the word would express wisdom and skill in formation and contrivance; as applied to periods it no less expresses wisdom and skill in arrangement and adjustment. The expression that they 'have been framed'^c tells us that their occurrence has not been left to chance, nor to the unforeseen, unintended operation of general laws, but determined, wisely determined—so that, whether they be periods of prosperity or disaster, of liberty or of oppression, of knowledge or of darkness, they have all of them been planned and arranged according to the counsels of a wisdom that is unerring.

As for *γεγονέναι*, 'were made,' it is certain that the strict and proper meaning of *γίνομαι*, its root, (as observed in a former paper^d), is *to become*, or *to be*, in the sense of *to begin to be*. It never signifies 'to be made,' in the sense in which we are accustomed to understand the expression '*to be made*;' so that, if in speaking of any formation or creation, whether of the world by God, or of any work of human artisanship, we employ this verb—the fact that it *is*, or *was*, or *began to be*, is all that the verb would express. *Γίνομαι* speaks only of events—never of acts; of a thing as *done*—not of a thing as *being done*. Upon this account the more correct translation of such texts as these, viz. :—

^c 'Were framed' (the common translation) is not thoroughly correct, the tense employed being not the aorist, as in Heb. i. 3, but the perfect—a tense which, unlike the aorist, connects the past time with the present; the result of the action spoken of being conceived as present and as permanent (Matthiæ, ii. § 1116, and Winer's *Idioms*, § 41). Whether the creation of the world, or the determination and framing of its periods be spoken of, cannot, however, be determined merely by the tense employed.

^d See *Journal* for Oct. 1850, p. 434.

'All things *were made* by him. and without him was not any thing *made* which *was made*;' John i. 3.

'The world *was made* by him;' *Ibid.* 10.

'The first Adam *was made* a living soul;' 1 Cor. xv. 45.

'They be no gods *which are made* with hands;' Acts xix. 26.

would be

'All things *were* by him, &c.'

'The world *was* by him.'

'The first Adam *became* a living soul;' and 'They be no gods which *are* by hands.'

Nothing, therefore, in support of the opinion that the world's creation is referred to, can be derived from the circumstance that *γεγονέναι* is employed to express the origin of the things of which the text makes mention, inasmuch as for the reasons already given, the correct translation of *γεγονέναι* is not '*were made*.'

With reference to this word, another very important point is the tense employed. It is not the Aorist, the tense of narrative, but the perfect middle. Now *γέγονέναι*, the perfect middle of *γίνομαι* (*to become*), is ordinarily employed to express that which, *having become*, 'was,' or, *having become*, 'is.' Consequently it may not unfrequently be translated either *was*, or *is*, as circumstances may require—*was*, if past existence be spoken of, *is*, if present. For although the perfect and present tenses of the *same* verb cannot be strictly equivalent, yet the present of a verb that speaks of *being*, may certainly be equivalent to the perfect of a verb that speaks of *origin*.

The perfect *γεγονέναι*, therefore, if circumstances require it, may be translated as if it were the present *εἶναι*;^{*} and in the present instance it would, I believe, be better that it should be so translated—not because 'have not become' is not literal, but because it is more agreeable to English usage to say that the things, or events, which we see '*are not* from things which do appear,' than to say that they '*have become not*.' An equivalent translation is often preferable to a so-called strictly literal translation. It is so, I believe, in the present case. A strictly literal translation is not unfrequently literal only in name.

* In the following instances the perfect middle *γέγονα* is so translated in our public version:—

'There *is* a remnant.'—Rom. xi. 5.

'Ye *are* dull of hearing.'—Heb. v. 11.

'Whereof all *are* partakers.'—xii. 8.

'He *is* guilty of all.'—Jam. ii. 10.

'Your garments *are* moth-eaten.'—v. 2.

'The latter end *is* worse.'—2 Peter ii. 20.

It might with equal propriety be so translated in as many more.

The sense in which we understand a preceding word will, of course, affect the sense in which we interpret those which follow. One word, or one phrase of a sentence, being misunderstood, of necessity gives a colouring to our interpretation of the whole. 'Worlds,' for instance, instead of 'ages' or 'periods,' being the translation with which we are most familiar, of the word *αἰῶνας*, and 'were made' instead of 'are,' the translation of *γεγονέναι*, we have been so accustomed to understand the verse as speaking merely of the world's original formation, and have been so habituated to regard the next expression in the verse that calls for remark (viz. *τὰ βλεπόμενα*, 'things that are seen'), as denoting the materialism of that creation, and the 'things which do not' (or, as some translate it, 'which did not') appear,' as denoting the nothing out of which the world was framed, that we naturally feel backward and unwilling to receive them in any other sense, and perhaps almost doubt whether, indeed, they can be understood in any other.

But to prove that they can, a very few words will, I trust, be quite sufficient. In Greek, the phrase 'things that are seen,' may, with as much propriety, be employed to denote events, as to denote the material objects of a visible creation. 'Go and shew John,' says our Lord, '*those things which ye do hear and see*;' 'Prophets have desired to see *those things which ye see*, and have not seen them;' the '*things not seen*' of verses 1 and 7 of the present chapter;^s these and a whole multitude of similar expressions might be produced to prove that we should do wrong if we were so to limit the expression, 'things that are seen,' as to suppose that it can refer only to what is tangible, and gross, and palpable.

The introduction of the article before *βλεπόμενα*, upon which some have fastened, as though it were a clear proof that the things of the visible creation were the things alone intended, determines nothing either way as to whether the material creation, or whether events, be the things referred to. Any one acquainted with the peculiarities of the usage of the article in Greek, knows well that 'the article is employed plurally to denote whole classes or descriptions of persons or things—the article being prefixed to plural nouns, whether substantive or adjective, almost universally (for exceptions, see pp. 61 *seq.*), so often as an affirmative is true alike of all the persons or things in question' (Middleton, *Greek Article*, p. 59). The article therefore is inserted not because *τὰ βλεπόμενα* is used as a substantive in the sense of 'the visible creation,' but because the *βλεπόμενα* spoken of are a class; and because that which is

^r Literally, 'not appearing.'

^s 'The evidence of things *not seen*.' 'By faith Noah being warned of God of things *not seen* as yet.'

affirmed of the class in question is alike true of every one of the things that constitute that class.

With reference to the remaining phrase, viz., that the things spoken of 'were not,' or 'are not, from things which *do appear*,' it is, to say the least, rather a strange way of saying that they were from things that *were not*. It would seem to be an expression much more applicable to the fact that events arise *from unseen causes*, than to the fact that the material world was created *from things that were not*—since φαίνεσθαι (*to appear*, literally, *to show themselves*) can properly be predicated only of those objects, the existence of which is manifest and real. The proper predicate of things that actually were not, would be that they *were not*—not that they *appeared* not.^b

Upon these grounds I would prefer to translate the second verse as follows:—'By faith we understand that *the ages*ⁱ (or *periods*) have been framed^k by the word of God; so that things which are seen (i. e. events) *are not* from things which do appear.'

If this translation be correct, and if the expression '*ages*' or '*periods*' be taken according to its strict and proper sense, the sentiment of the former portion of the verse is clearly this; viz., that '*ages*' or '*periods*' are wholly according to the will of God; arising each one of them, when commanded, at his bidding; bearing each one of them their respective characteristics, according as God has determined with respect to each of them; and, having accomplished his purposes, departing at his bidding, leaving behind them their impression and effect. That they do so arise, and do so depart, apart from revelation, it would, of course, be impossible for us to say with certainty. Even as it is, we are naturally more disposed to ascribe them, more especially some of them, to chance, or to merely secondary causes, rather than to God. But that all periods are thus dependent upon the will of God is clearly the doctrine of Scripture (*vide, e. g.* Dan. ii. 21; Ps. xxxi. 15; Isai. iii. 1-4, xlv. 7; Jerem. xxvii. 5-7; Amos iii. 6; Acts xvii. 26; 1 Tim. vi. 15), however unwilling we may be to receive it, or whatever may be the difficulties in which the belief may be thought to involve us. Why God should have willed much that he has willed, we may, indeed, be quite incompetent to decide, or even to conjecture; but what Scripture declares, that we by faith believe,

^b φαίνεσθαι, *to appear*, or *to show* itself, must not be confounded with δοκεῖν, *to appear*. The latter may, or may not, be used in reference to things which are not; but whether the former is ever so used may, I think, be questioned. At any rate, such is not its ordinary or proper usage.—See Pillon's *Greek Synonymes*, edit. Arnold, § 183.

ⁱ *The ages*; i. e. *all ages*.—*Vid.* quotation from Middleton, *supra*, p. 433.

^k *Viz.* either in purpose or in act. *In act*, those which have been, or which actually are; *in purpose*, those which are yet to come.

and in the midst of whatsoever may be to us mysterious and dark, rejoice in the belief, knowing that He that rules is wise, and just, and good.

‘A belief,’ says Fuller, ‘in the doctrine of a general and most particular Providence, taken in its connection with various others, secures a serene and joyful satisfaction in *all* the events of time. All the vicissitudes of nations, all the furious oppositions to the church of Christ, all the efforts to overturn the doctrine of the cross, or to blot out the spirit of Christianity from the earth, we consider as permitted for wise and holy ends. Being satisfied that they make a part of God’s eternal plan, we are not inordinately anxious about them. They give us no other pain than that which arises from good will to men. We have no doubt that these things are wisely permitted; that they are a fan in the hand of Christ, by which he will thoroughly purge his floor; that the true gospel of Christ, like the sun in the heavens, will finally disperse all these interposing clouds; that things, upon the whole, whether we in our contracted sphere of observation perceive it or not, are tending to the general good; that the empire of truth and righteousness, notwithstanding all the infidelity and iniquity that are in the world, is upon the increase; that it will increase yet more and more; that glorious things are yet to be accomplished in the church of God; and that all that we have hitherto seen or heard of the gospel dispensation is but as the first-fruits of an abundant harvest.’—*Calvinistic and Socinian Systems*, chap. 13.

A variety of picked instances, illustrative of the minute and apparently unimportant circumstances, or concurrence of circumstances, upon which events have hung, and by which the character and existence of periods of prosperity and advancement have been determined, are given (though without a sufficient reference to original authorities) as a proof of a superintending Providence, in a very interesting work, recently published, entitled, *The Hand of God in History*, by Hollis or Morris Read;^m but if *all* periods are of God, we must recognise as willed and framed by Him periods of disaster and of evil, no less than periods of prosperity and good—the period, for instance, even of re-ascendant Popery when Mary reigned, no less than the period of England’s or of Europe’s reformation; and must believe that the unpopularity of Northumberland, so that even Protestants dreaded to receive a queen of his appointment, the failure of his endeavours to obtain possession of the persons of Mary and Elizabeth (through timely intelligence communicated to them of his designs against them), and the unwillingness of Lady Jane Grey herself, to accept, and her readiness to resign the offered crown,—circumstances which

^m Originally printed in America. The Christian name of the author, according to the reprint published by Collins, is *Hollis*; according to the edition edited by Christmas, and published by Bentley, it is *Morris*.—‘*O, quem te memorem?*’

issued in the secure establishment upon the throne of a Popish and persecuting queen—were as much of God, as the singular train of circumstances which led to the establishment, first on the continent, and then in this country, of the religion under which we have grown great—the religion of the Reformation.

But though events and periods are all of them of God, it does not follow that their being or non-being are in no respect dependent on ourselves. It may be quite true that God has forewilled all things, and that that which he has willed shall take effect; but even though it be, it is more in accordance with the manner of Scripture, and more adapted to our capacities and nature, to speak of events (of those of them, at least, that are in any sense begotten through the medium of the agency of man) as if they were contingent, than to speak of them as immutably, unconditionally, irreversibly decreed (see Jerem. xviii. 7-10; 1 Sam. ii. 30, xii. 24, 25; Jonah iii. 10, &c. &c.);ⁿ and to speak of prayer as if it were effectual to influence the determinations even of Him that is unchangeable, than to represent effort and prayer as unavailing, because God has pre-determined (*vide* James iv. 2; v. 16, &c.)^a All that conduces to bring about through human agency a pre-determined event, being itself foreknown, it is clear that God could as easily, and in perfect consistency with human freedom, and with as much precision, pre-determine correspondently thereto, as though his determinations were withheld until that which was foreseen took place—God's predeterminations (those which are altogether absolute and unconditional being alone excepted) being, we may suppose, founded on exactly the same reasons as those on which they would be founded, if, instead of being already formed, they were as yet unformed, uncertain, and contingent. His sure foreknowledge, therefore, of what we shall do, whilst it secures the unchangeableness of his own predetermi-

ⁿ 'At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up and pull down, and destroy it; if that nation against whom I have pronounced turn from their evil, *I will repent of the evil* that I thought to do unto them. And at what instant I shall speak concerning a nation and concerning a kingdom, to build and to plant it, if it do evil in my sight, *then will I repent of the good* wherewith I said I would benefit them.' '*I said indeed* that thy house and the house of thy father should walk before me for ever; *but now the Lord saith*, Be it far from me, for them that honour me I will honour, and they that despise me shall be lightly esteemed.' 'Only fear the Lord, and serve him in truth with all your heart; for consider how great things he hath done for you. But, if ye shall still do wickedly, ye shall be consumed, both ye and your king.' 'And God saw their works that they turned from their evil way, and *God repented of the evil* that he had said that he would do unto them; and *he did it not*.' Upon this latter text see Fairbairn's very excellent remarks in his *Life, Character, and Mission of the Prophet Jonah*, pp. 128-225, Edib. 1849.

^a 'Ye have not, because ye ask not.' 'The effectual, fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much.'

nations, leaves us as free to act or to abstain from acting, as though he had not foreknown, or as though he had not decreed; whilst it no less leaves untouched and unimpeached the reasonableness of the expectation that action is more likely to beget a desired result than fatuous inaction, and prayer than idle objections grounded upon its supposed incompatibility with God's immutability.^p

With respect to the sentiment contained in the assertion of the latter portion of the verse ('so that things which are seen are not from things which do appear'), it seems to be this: viz., that the real and efficient cause of events is unseen; and, except to faith, unknown: or, in other words, that 'We can give,' as Bishop Butler says, 'the *whole account* of no one thing whatever.'

To a certain extent, indeed, we may be able to recognise the connection between cause and effect. To a certain extent we may even be able to produce a designed effect. But still it remains true that there is not anything whatever of which we know the whole cause; nor anything whatever that we can predict or produce with certainty.

The simplest instances of cause and effect are manifestly those which are purely physical; and yet the connection between physical cause and physical effect can be recognised only *as a fact*. Why the physical cause is in any case efficient to produce the physical effect, except that God has so willed it, we are altogether unable to declare. When, therefore, (as is well observed by Dr. Arnott, in the Introduction to his well-known work, the *Elements of Physics*,) a person gives a reason or explanation of any physical fact, other than that it is a fact, or, in other words, than that the Creator has willed it—

'he is merely, although he may not be aware of it, asserting its resemblance to other physical facts, no one of which he understands better than itself; what he calls a general truth, or law, or principle, being merely an expression for the observed but unaccountable resemblance of the facts. Thus, when a man says that a stone falls because of attraction or gravitation, he only uses a word which recalls thousands of instances which he has witnessed, of one body approaching another; but any cause of the approach, other than that God has willed it, is to him utterly unknown.'

With respect to the phenomena of mind, also, doubtless there is a settled and fixed connection between cause and effect, no less than in the material world. And yet who can with certainty beget an event, or even thoroughly account for an event. In speculating as to the cause or causes of an event, the very utmost than can be

^p For further remarks upon these points, see Dwight's *Theology*, Sermon. xiv., xv., and cxliii.; and Gordon's *Sermons*, pp. 350-394, Edinb. 1825.

done is to ascertain the event or events which preceded, and which apparently produced it ; and to call the prior event or events the cause of that by which they were succeeded. That which is palpable, material, and gross, we may be able to detect ; but the mind or minds, the interests, the passions, and all the *et cætera* of complicated circumstance, upon which the apparent and so-called cause was brought to bear, are altogether hidden from us. And even though they were not, yet still would it be as much beyond our power to ascertain in what way it was that all the multitude of circumstances which were auxiliary thereto, arose just then and there, as to tell why these so-called causes so operated upon the minds of those concerned in the production of the event that followed, as to beget that event. And yet, if all and every one of these things, no less than that which is more palpable, were concerned in the production of the will, or act, or effort, which led to the event ; and if the real cause be, as it certainly is, that which gave to these several so-called causes their efficiency, that which actually decided, that without which all other causes would have been powerless ; is it not clear that the real and determining cause of events is an unknown, unseen cause ; and that 'the things that are seen are not from things that do appear' ?

And not only so, but the so-called cause, the prior event, which we think ourselves warranted to speak of as the cause of the event by which it was succeeded, could not itself have been uncaused. Even if it were the whole cause, it would be but the proximate cause. We must travel backwards then, backwards and backwards, until the retrocession makes us giddy. But in the attempt to trace these causes backward, the limit of our researches is soon reached ; and we are compelled to confess that, with respect to the very simplest instance of cause and effect, we see but in part and know but in part, and that 'things which are seen are not from things that do appear.'

If this be true of single events, how much less are we able to ascertain the cause or causes of a series. Apart from revelation, we could not tell when we saw this or that period or event arising, whether it arose and showed itself at the will and bidding of God, or whether it did not. We might conjecture respecting it, but we could not conclude with certainty. That it did so arise is so far from obvious to the eye of reason, that men more frequently refer events, and acts, and periods, to anything rather than to God. A virtual Atheism is the acknowledged creed of thousands. But revelation informs us that periods are by the word of God, and that 'things which are seen are not from things which do appear.' 'And, by faith, this,' says the apostle, 'we' (i. e. we who have faith) 'believe.'

Now,

Now, if the sentiments of the verse be as above supposed, it is obvious that the belief of which it speaks, (a belief which recognises God in all things, and which, if really entertained, cannot but be influential,) is more palpably an act of faith than the common, and even amongst the heathen the almost universal belief that in the beginning a God merely created all things. To believe that all *periods* are of God, and that it is He who secretly renders effectual or ineffectual those causes by which they are produced, must necessarily beget and keep alive within us a spirit of devotion and of dependence, such as it becomes the creature to cherish with reference to Him upon whom he is dependent; and such also as in the language of Scripture is commonly spoken of as constituting that affection of the heart denominated FAITH. For not all belief is Faith; at least, not all belief is Faith in the scriptural or theological sense of the word. The belief of the mere intellect, or of mere education, or of prejudice, or of ignorance, and the belief of the affections and of the heart, may be called by the same name, but ('what's a name?') they are not the same thing.

J. C. K.

THE JEWISH WAR UNDER HADRIAN AND TRAJAN.*

UNDER the above title H. Muentert, the late Bishop of Copenhagen, has written an interesting account of the final overthrow of the Jewish people. This narrative, throwing light on a portion of history which up to his time had not been sufficiently illustrated, was translated into English by W. Wadden Turner, Esq., instructor in the Union Theological Seminary, N. Y., and inserted into the third volume of the American periodical, *Bibliotheca Sacra*.

On perusing this article various remarks occurred to my mind,

* This communication, which casts light upon some difficult and obscure points in a very interesting portion of Jewish history, will be acceptable to our readers. In the feeling that the circumstances of this war have not received all the consideration to which they are entitled, we hope shortly to bring under the notice of our readers a curious manuscript volume which is in our possession, in which some of the details of this war are fully discussed and illustrated. The work, a closely written folio, is from the pen of the learned Joseph Hussey of Cambridge; and the reason of its non-publication appears in the following inscription on the last page:— 'This large labour, as first proposed, being judged unfit, by reason of the method, style, and want of other management, to be published to the world, was in the year 1703 broken off and quite laid aside by me JOSEPH HUSSEY.' These are words full of painful suggestion to one who beholds the vast quantity of profound and laborious research embodied in this incomplete work.

which

which I thought might interest the student of sacred history, and having put them down in the order in which the particulars of the narrative had suggested them, I submit them to your editorial discretion as to whether you deem them worthy of publication or not. I shall not transcribe the whole account, but only quote those passages on which I have observations to make.

P. 402.—‘Egypt appears to have been stripped of troops, which were probably used by the emperor for the Parthian war, for the revolt kept continually spreading. Its leader is named Lucuas by Eusebius, and by Dion Cassius, Andreas. Perhaps, like many Jews of that period, he bore a double name—one Jewish, the other Roman, for Lucuas appears to be a corruption from Lucius.’

To this the following foot-note is added :—

‘Reimarus on Dion. The Arabic text of Abulpharagius calls him Lucinum, the Syriac Lumpsium ; both of them corruptions.’

The concurrence of three authors, whose works are extant in three different languages, in assigning to the Jewish leader a name expressive of light, without however designating him by one and the same name, makes it probable that he went by a Hebrew epithet taken from the idea of light. Analogous cases incline me to the opinion that his adherents, in order to convey the exalted notions they entertained of his mission, called him, in allusion to Gen. i. 16, where the sun is meant, ‘the light.’ Every tyro in rabbinical literature knows that this and similar titles were and are ascribed by Jews to eminent co-religionists ; and this leader may have received the epithet alluded to in the same manner as the later Bar Cochba (Son of the Star) was called so in reference to Numb. xxiv. 17, although his real name was Simon. This conjecture will satisfactorily account for the names Lucuas, Lucinum, and Lumpsium, which being independent translations of one and the same Hebrew word, can only agree in the leading idea of the original, viz., light, and reconciles Dion with the other authors, the former only having been acquainted with his real name. There is, therefore, no necessity, as Jost and Milman have done, of assuming two leaders of the rebellion, the one called Lucuas and the other Andreas. Indeed the habit of the Jews of not calling their eminent men by their names, but by honourable epithets conferred on them after they had attained to distinction, is expressly sanctioned, or rather enjoined, by a rabbinical precept thus conveyed by Maimonides in *Hilkoth. Talmud Torah*, chap. v :—‘It is prohibited to a disciple to call his teacher (rabbi) by his name, even in his absence ; this, however, holds good only if it be a distinguished name, so that whoever hears it will know at once that such a one is meant.’

P. 403.—‘Rabbi David Gans, in the *Meor Enaim*, gives, according to the testimony of R. Asariah de Rossi (in what age he lived is not accurately known), the number of slain at 20,000.’

This statement requires some correction, for R. David Gans is not, as would appear from the text before us, the author of *Meor Enaim*, but R. Asaria, who, according to his own declaration in p. 174 of the work alluded to, commenced it in 5331, and brought it to a conclusion in 5333, A.M., corresponding with 1572 A.D.

The cause assigned by Muentzer, after Dion Cassius, for the outbreak of the sanguinary insurrection of the Jews against the Romans under Hadrian, was, the determination of the emperor to restore Jerusalem, to fortify it, and to send thither a colony, consisting mostly of veterans, and sufficient for the defence of the city; a determination which, according to Eusebius, was carried into execution after the subjugation of the rebels. Now this may have been one of the causes, but certainly not the only one, nor the first in the order of time. The Talmud mentions another, which is so much in keeping with the general character of Hadrian and with the line of policy pursued by him in the East, that I do not hesitate to place in the rabbinical account full historical faith.

It is known that after the death of Trajan his successor found himself encumbered with recent conquests which tended rather to swell the extent of the empire than to increase its strength; and that in order to insure to himself a peaceful reign, Hadrian relinquished the newly conquered provinces, and moreover adopted other measures calculated to pacify the agitated East. It is also admitted that one of the greatest obstacles to the success of the Romans in the East was the hatred of the Jews to their oppressors and the destroyers of their sanctuary, and that Trajan only shortly before his death had, after much bloodshed, succeeded in quelling another insurrection of that people. Hadrian, who was in Syria at the time of his accession to the throne, must from personal experience have been convinced of the necessity of putting an effective stop to these repeated risings. His acute mind must soon have discovered the alternative before him. He must either destroy the Jews as a nation, or by rebuilding the temple, and thus himself realizing the object of those insurrections, bind the Jews to Rome by the ties of gratitude. The monarch, as we learn from the Talmud (*Tract. Abodah Sarah*, c. i.), was at first inclined to adopt the former expedient, for he deliberated with his council whether it were not more advisable to cut off a sick limb from the body than to allow the frame constantly to suffer. But convinced by one Petrat bar Shallma of the impracticability of such a project, he then resorted to the other expedient. The permission

permission of rebuilding the temple is ascribed to Trajan (*Bereshith Rab.* 65, and *Yalkut*, sect. vi.), and was given at the solicitation of R. Yohua ben Chauina.^b Taking the main fact for granted, and considering that Epiphanius (*De Pond. et Mens*, c. xiv.) expressly states that Hadrian in the beginning of his reign, and before he repaired to Rome, visited Jerusalem, and resolved to rebuild that town, it seems that Jost (*Geschichte der Israeliten*, vol iii. chap. x.) is right when he proposes to substitute the name of Hadrian for that of Trajan. But when, on re-consideration, the permission seemed to be a too dangerous experiment, more likely to foster the indomitable desire for independence by giving the nation a powerful centre, than to subdue their turbulent spirit, the emperor did not openly revoke the leave granted, but, in true consonance with his character, he laid down such an order for the proportions in the new structure as he knew that the Jews, according to their law, could not comply with. The consternation of the Rabbis assembled at Rimmon was great at this disappointment. The nation now knew what they had to expect from the new emperor, and they were ready to endeavour to extort by violence what had been refused to their humble entreaties.

The exact period when the conquest of Bethar brought the rebellion to a conclusion has not yet been ascertained, since the statements of ancient authors alluding to this event are of a very conflicting nature. Muenther, Jost, Milman, and the writer of the articles 'Hadrian' and 'Barcochebas' in the *Penny Cyclopædia*, have followed the opinion of those who fix it for 135 A.D. This assumption, however, is subject to very great and perhaps insurmountable difficulties.

The first is the express and repeated statement of Rabbi Yose that Bethar was conquered in the fifty-second year after the destruction of the temple, that is, 122 C.E. This statement is made in *Talm. Yerush. : Tract. Taanith*, chap. iv., and in *Ekaḥ Rabba*, V. 'Bala yehovah.' Now this R. Yose was contemporary with the rebellion, and a disciple of Rabbi Akiba, who, as is known, acted a most prominent part in the war. The same rabbi is also the author of the chronicle *Seder Olam*, and is in general attentive to the exact dates of the periods of the events to which he alludes. The date fixed by the rabbi being written in words and not ex-

^b That this famous Rabbi, distinguished among the Talmudists for his learning and ready wit, had access to the Emperor we know also from another source; for in the very ancient book *Bereshith Rabba* a conversation concerning the resurrection of the dead is recorded as having taken place between Hadrian and R. Yohua. Nothing comports better with the character of the inquisitive emperor, who, during his extensive travels, conversed with contemporaneous sages, than a conference with a scholar occupying so prominent a position among his people.

pressed by letters, it is scarcely possible that the ancient transcribers could have committed an error in their copies, and as it is not possible to imagine what purpose could have been served by a falsification of the date, it appears to me that the presumption is strong in favour of the statement of the rabbi. It is true Dion Cassius fixes this catastrophe for 135 c.e. But if it be considered that on these events we do not possess his original account, but only a meagre abridgment made by Hiliphin in the twelfth century, and which is moreover pronounced an indifferent performance (*Penny Cyclop.*, art. 'Dion'); that Dion was not a contemporary like the rabbi, but wrote his history 90 years after the death of Hadrian; that, moreover, even if this historian possessed the means for ascertaining the precise period, he certainly lacked the interest for doing so which impelled the Jew;—it appears to me that the evidence of the rabbi must by far outweigh that of the Roman. The evidence of Spartianus, Eusebius, of R. Abraham ben David and R. David Gans, can the less be taken into consideration, the more distant they lived from the period in which the events narrated happened, and the more scanty the original sources flowed from which they could have derived their information.

Secondly. Dion says that although conquerors, yet so great had been the loss of the Romans, that Hadrian in his epistle to the senate left out the usual formula, 'If you and your children are well, myself and the army are doing well.' From this it is evident that Dion considered the emperor as having in person been present at the conquest—a statement expressly affirmed by rabbinical writers (*Echa Rabb.*; also Basnage, xi. p. 364). But as we know (Muentzer's *Jewish Wars*, &c., p. 419) that in A.D. 135 Hadrian was at Athens, this assertion, if the date of the fall of Bether is correct, cannot, without straining, be reconciled with the inference that Hadrian was present at the conquest.

Thirdly. Although Jerome, following Eusebius, places the appearance of Barcochebas in the 17th year of the reign of Hadrian, yet he states elsewhere 'et post quinquaginta annos (meaning

* Suspicious as to the correctness of the text in fixing the rebellion of the Jews in 886 u.c. are excited, when it is noticed that whilst the events related in the 11th chapter of the 69th book refer to the year 875 u.c., those narrated in the 18th chapter (viz., the rebellion of the Jews) are stated to have taken place in 886. Whilst there is no evidence to show that the events related in the two successive chapters were not contiguous, the dates assigned exhibit a strange gap of eleven years, which is scarcely conceivable when the close connection of the events related in the preceding and following chapters be duly considered; and although Spartianus antedates the death of Antinous in Egypt, yet his evidence goes to show that no long interval passed between that occurrence and the rebellion of the Jews, and that, therefore, a period of eleven years did not intervene, as would appear from Hiliphin.

after the destruction of the temple) sub Aelio Hadriano usque ad solum incensa civitas (meaning Jerusalem) atque deleta est, ita ut pristinum quoque nomen amiserit' (*Comment. in Ezech. cap. vi.*). The same date is again given in his *Com. to Isaiah*, c. vi. Now it is admitted on all hands that the conquest of Jerusalem preceded that of Bether, and since the rabbinical authority alluded to fixes the fall of that stronghold fifty-two years after the destruction of the temple, the evidence of the Jew is corroborated by that of the Christian, who certainly, from the object of his researches, had more interest than Dion in rightly investigating the matter. To a similar result also leads the testimony of Abulpharagius, who in the Arabic text expressly states that Barcochebas made his appearance in the 4th year of the reign of Hadrian, which is 122 A.D., or 52 after the destruction of the temple.

Fourthly. The year of the fall of Jerusalem given in the *Chron. Alexandrinum* is that of the consulship of H. and Rusticus, which took place 119 C.E.; and as the siege of Bether is said to have lasted 2½ years, this brings us again to the year 52 fixed by the rabbi. Supported by this body of evidence, I think I may safely depart from Muentzer and other historians of the Jews (who without sufficient reason have fixed the event alluded to in 135 C.E.) and place it in 122 C.E.^d

As the dates connected with the travels of Hadrian and the events under discussion appear so conflicting, I shall endeavour to reconcile them, following in this attempt the conjectures of the profound Rappaport, as stated in *Kerem Chemed*, v. VII. p. 179. According to this scholar, the 9th and 10th chapters describe the various journeys undertaken by Hadrian after his return from Antioch to Rome, the festivities celebrated in his honour in the various towns through which he passed, and his mourning over the death of the empress Plautina in 872. The 11th records

^d An indirect proof that the conquest of Bether must have taken place about the time mentioned may be found in the account contained with slight variations in both Talmuds (*Tract. Sukkah*, f. 51, p. 2), that owing to an imprudent statement of R. Simon ben Yockai denounced to the Romans during the persecution of the Jews consequent upon the rising under Bar Cochba, the Rabbi absconded and lived for thirteen years concealed in a cave, until he was in a miraculous manner informed of the death of the emperor, when he came forth from his hiding-place and was sent by his co-religionists on an embassy to the new emperor, in order to effect the repeal of the edict prohibiting the Jews from circumcision and the celebration of the Sabbath (*Meila*, f. xvii.). Now this new emperor could only have been Antoninus Pius, the successor of Hadrian, as we know from history that shortly after his accession to the throne these obnoxious decrees were repealed. The death of his predecessor, therefore, alluded to in the Talmud, could only have been that of Hadrian. But as this emperor only reigned twenty-one years, R. Simon must have absconded in the eighth year of Hadrian's reign, that is, not long after the 122 A.D., at which time the Jewish rebellion raged.

his journey through Greece, Palestine, and Egypt, the death of his favourite Antinous, &c., in 875. The 12th chapter treats of the idolatrous worship which the emperor established at Jerusalem, and the consequent rebellion of the Jews. This, according to Rappaport, is erroneously stated to have taken place in 886. According to that scholar the rebellion broke out in 873 or 874, when Jerusalem, according to Jerome and other writers, was conquered. This explanation restores the close connection evidently joining this chapter to the preceding one, and perfectly agrees with the statement in chap. vii., that as long as the emperor was in Egypt the Jews refrained from violence, and also during his second stay in Syria, through which he must have passed a second time, after he had once before visited it on his way to Egypt in his journey from that country to some other district. The contents of the 12th, 13th, and 14th chapters, treating of the rebellion of the Jews, must be referred to the years 873—878, when the importance of the emergency called the emperor from Athens, where he then stayed, to the scene of war, at the conclusion of which, viz. at the conquest of Bethar, he was present. This explanation also elucidates the account of Abulpharagius, who joins in point of time the sojourn of Hadrian at Athens with the rebellion under Bar Cocheba.*

In a note to the following passage from Syncellus, in his Chronography (Script. Byzant. ix. p. 348) on p. 422, 'τῆς λουδαίων ἀποστάσεως Χοχέβαστος (Χοχέβας τις) ὁ μονογενὴς ἠγείτο ὡς ἐξημέυετο ἀστῆρ,' Muentzer puts the question, 'Can he, as the pretended Messiah, ever have received the title μονογενὴς ἡγείτο?' To this I reply in the affirmative: יְחִיד בְּדוֹרָיו (unique in his generation) is a title frequently given by Hebrew writers to eminent men.

The question, Whence did the rebel leader derive the large and uninterrupted supply of pecuniary means so absolutely necessary for an extensive and protracted war? is only vaguely and unsatisfactorily answered by Muentzer, in mentioning 'rich contributions that flowed to him from all quarters' (p. 430) as his sources of revenue. But the nature, shape, and manner in which these contributions came in regularly, even from such quarters as had not participated in the rebellion, becomes evident, when the close connection of the leader with the most celebrated and influential rabbi of the age, Rabbi Akiba, and through him, no doubt, with the

* To this event may perhaps also be referred the statement of Eusebius (Chron. p. 381, ed. Mediolan.), 'Hadrian Judaeos, qui ter contra Romanos rebellaverunt, ad obedientiam revocavit.' This is said to have taken place in the first year of the reign of Hadrian. It must however be confessed that the Greek text from Syncellus, 'Ἀδριανὸς λουδαίους κατὰ Ἀλεξανδρέων στασιάζοντας ἐκόλασεν,' is not favourable to this conjecture.

Sanhedrin, is borne in mind. It is known that as long as the temple stood, the Jews, wherever they happened to live, paid a certain annual tax (said to have been prescribed in Exod. xxx. 13) to the sanctuary, and that the levying of this *διδραχμὸν* (the amount paid by every adult Jew) was considered as legal by the Romans themselves (Jos. *Ant.* xvi. 6). And although Titus, after the destruction of the temple, sought to divert this tax from its original purpose by ordering the Jews to pay it to Jupiter Capitolinus, yet would the nation continue to pay, besides the compulsory impost to the idol, the usual didrachmon for the benefit of what was now considered the centre of the people—the Sanhedrin or the Patriarchat. (See Zunzen's *Zeitschrift für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums*, vol. i. p. 262.) Now, as this tax was of long standing, there must have been a regular machinery in operation for raising it, and thus both the revenue and the mode of procuring it are clearly pointed out.

Speaking of the recapture of Jerusalem under Hadrian, Muentzer says—

‘The surrounding region was dreadfully desolated. Wolves and hyenas made inroads on the city itself. R. Akiba, therefore, according to the interpretation given by Samuel Petit to a passage in Aben Ezra, caused the celebration of the passover to be transferred from Mount Nisan to Mount Jyar’ (Aben Ezra in Levit. xxiii. cited by S. Petit, *Eclog. Chronolog.* i. 14).

I have no means of consulting the work of Petit; but on referring to the Comment. of Aben Ezra I find the following passage (no doubt quoted from the Talmudic Treatise *Sanhedrin*, f. 12): ואמרו על דברי עקיבא שקבע שתי שנים מעוברות שנה אחר שנה לפי צורך שעה (‘And they said of R. Akiba that he fixed two intercalary years one after the other according to the emergency of the hour’). Whether the passage alluded to by Petit exists in any of the rabbinical writings I greatly doubt, since to the best of my knowledge there never existed in Palestine either a Mount Nisan or Mount Jyar, nor were the Jews required, after the destruction of the temple, to celebrate the passover on any particular spot. The quotation from Aben Ezra not being correct, the inferences drawn from it by Muentzer (p. 426) of course fall to the ground.

B.

MISCELLANEA.

ARE THE WORDS EPH. v. 14 TO BE REGARDED AS A QUOTATION FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT SCRIPTURES?

‘ Δεὸ λέγει· Ἐγείραι ὁ καθεύδων καὶ ἀνάστα ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, καὶ ἐπιφανέσῃ σοὶ Χριστός.’
Eph. v. 14.

‘ Wherefore he saith, Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light.’

THE difficulty connected with regarding these words as a quotation from the Old Testament Scriptures, arises from the fact, that there is no one passage of the Old Testament to which they bear any very close analogy. The consequence is, that commentators have been much divided in opinion. Dr. Doddridge satisfies himself with a reference to Is. lx. 1; remarking that ‘this is the most natural import of those well-known words.’ But the analogy here, if any, is far-fetched and imperfect. Vastly more probable is the opinion of those who consider the words as taken from Is. xxvi. 19. ‘Some have supposed,’ says Mr. Barnes, ‘that the words are taken from some book among the Hebrews, which is now lost. Epiphanius supposed that it was a quotation from a prophecy of Elijah; Syncellus and Euthalius from some writing of Jeremiah’ (an opinion countenanced by Saurin, Ser., vol. x. p. 286); ‘Hyppolitus from the writing of some now unknown prophet.’ Jerome supposed it was taken from some apocryphal writing. Grotius supposes that it refers to the word *light* in ver. 13, and that the sense is, ‘that light says; that is, that a man who is pervaded by that light, let him so say to another.’ Heuman, and after him Storr, Michaelis, and Jennings (*Jewish Ant.* ii. 232), suppose that the reference is to a song or hymn that was sung by the early Christians, beginning in this manner, and that the meaning is, ‘Wherefore as it is said in the hymns which we sing—

‘ Awake, thou that sleepest;
Arise from the dead;
Christ shall give thee light!’

Others have supposed that there is an allusion to the sentiment among the Jews respecting the significancy of the blowing of the trumpet on the first day of the month, or the feast of the new moon. Maimonides conjectures that the call of the trumpet, especially in the month Tisri, in which the great day of atonement occurred, was designed to signify a special call to repentance;

ance; meaning, 'You who sleep arouse from your slumbers; search and try yourselves; think on your Creator; repent and attend to the salvation of the soul.' *

After referring to these opinions, Mr. Barnes observes, 'But all this is evidently conjecture. I see no evidence that Paul meant to make a quotation at all. Why may we not suppose that he speaks as an inspired man, and that he means to say simply, that God *now* gives this command, or that God *now* speaks in this way?'

With this view, however, I cannot altogether agree. Whatever difficulty may be found in ascertaining the quotation or allusion in the Old Testament, I cannot help thinking the passage must after all be regarded as such. The formula $\delta\iota\omicron\lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon$, $\lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\gamma\alpha\rho$, or $\lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon$, occurs in several other passages, and is always employed to introduce a quotation. (Compare 2 Cor. vi. 2; Gal. iii. 16; Eph. iv. 8; Heb. i. 6.) In the passage Eph. iv. 8, the very same formula is employed $\delta\iota\omicron\lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon$ to introduce a quotation from Psal. lxxviii. 18. Can we suppose the same writer in the same writing should so far depart from his usual style? I think not.

But the question still remains to be settled, whence is the quotation obtained? The first part of the words, viz. 'Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead,' whatever objections may present themselves, is, in my view, a paraphrastic quotation of the passage referred to above, Is. xxvi. 19, 'Awake and sing ye that dwell in the dust.' The remaining part of the verse, 'And Christ shall give thee light,' may be regarded as either added by the Apostle for the enforcement of the foregoing exhortation, or as an allusion to some other passage of the Old Testament. With regard to the first supposition, it may be observed that it is not an unusual thing for the writers of the New Testament to expand the sentiment in a quotation by adding something of their own; nor are they generally very solicitous about the precise words, provided the sense is maintained.

But we may suppose the words, 'And Christ shall give thee light,' as an allusion to some passage of Old Testament Scripture. We have instances of the inspired writers of the New Testament combining in one quotation different passages of the Old Testament (compare Heb. i. 8, 9, 10). Taking this view, therefore, we should regard the words, 'And Christ shall give thee light,' as an allusion to some passage of Scripture in which the Messiah is spoken of as giving light. Such a passage is Is. xlii. 6, 'I the Lord have called in righteousness, and will hold thine hand, and will keep thee, and give for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles.' Similar words also occur Is. xlix. 6, 'I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou may be my

* Burder, in *Ros. Alt. u. Neu Morgenland*, in loc.; Albert Barnes on *Eph.*, p. 127. salvation

salvation unto the end of the earth.' I cannot help, therefore, regarding the words as an allusion to some such passage, suggested, however, by the word 'light,' verse 13. It is not indispensable, however, that we should consider the latter clause as a quotation, but the first part must, I think, according to the principles of sound criticism, be regarded in that light.

PAUL'S THORN IN THE FLESH.

NOT a few commentators have puzzled themselves about the thorn in the flesh referred to by the Apostle Paul as the messenger of Satan sent to buffet him. The difficulty has been to determine with certainty what the Apostle means by it, and it may well be doubted whether this can ever be wholly overcome. It were tedious to enumerate all the opinions on the subject. Tertullian thought it meant the ear or head-ache; Jerome the head-ache; good Richard Baxter fancied it must have been the stone or gravel, by which malady he himself was affected. The most whimsical opinion I know is that of Teller, in his *Wörterbuch*—'Eine figurliche Beschreibung der reissenden Gicht, besonders Kopfgicht, Migraine' (*A figurative description of racking gout, especially head-gout megrim*). Dr. Doddridge, adopting the opinion of Whitby, thinks 'that the view he (the Apostle) had of celestial glories, affected the system of his nerves in such a manner as to occasion some *paralytic* symptoms, and particularly a *stammering* in his speech, and perhaps some ridiculous *distortion* in his countenance, referred to elsewhere in the phrase of the *infirmity in his flesh*.'

But such opinions, after all, are but mere suppositions. The expression, 'a thorn in the flesh,' is evidently metaphorical. It means something that annoys, occasions pain and trouble. Moreover, the thorn in the flesh was the messenger of Satan, that is, it was to be ascribed to the agency and intervention of the devil. Now, that the thorn in the flesh was no other than the troubles and persecutions which the Apostle had to endure in the exercise of his ministry, I am inclined to think, on the following grounds:—

First, the character of the trials to which the Apostle was subjected, corresponds with the explanation given above of the thorn in the flesh—the messenger of Satan. That they were earthly trials to which the Apostle makes reference, appears from the employment of the word *flesh*. Moreover, Satan is spoken of in Scripture as the author of persecution. This he effects by stirring up the ungodly powers of earth to persecute the people of God (compare Rev. ii. 10).

Secondly, the Apostle refers to his past experience. The vision of which he gives an account, he had enjoyed about fourteen years ago. The thorn in the flesh followed upon that event. His sufferings and trials then commenced, of which we have an account (Chap. ii. 23). Thus we find these answering to the time during which he had the visitation of the thorn in the flesh.

Thirdly, by the word *infirmities* (ἀσθενείαι), it is obvious the Apostle means the same thing as by the expression 'thorn in the flesh.' He informs us that God had given him the promise that his grace would be sufficient for him. 'Most gladly therefore,' says he, 'will I bear mine infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest upon me.' The meaning of which language is plainly this—the more cheerfully would he submit to his thorn in the flesh (his infirmities) as he had this promise to support him, and as occasion would thus be afforded for the manifestation of the sufficiency of divine grace. But are we to regard the word *infirmities* as a general term expressive of the Apostle's trials in the prosecution of his work? I think so. He had given an enumeration of his troubles in the preceding chapter. He then speaks of them, ver. 30, as the *τα τῆς ἀσθενείας μου*, the things of his infirmity, or what constituted his infirmities. After speaking of the promise of the sufficient grace of God and of its manifestation in his infirmities, he goes on to say, that, on that account, he would take pleasure in infirmities. The *διο* marks this pleasure in infirmities as the consequence of the promise, but the promise was given in reference to the thorn in the flesh, therefore the thorn in the flesh and his infirmities must be one and the same thing. But I have shown that *infirmities* is a general expression for the Apostle's sufferings in every shape. It is no objection to this view that the Apostle, verse 10, mentions also 'reproaches,' 'necessities,' 'persecutions,' 'distresses,' as it is no uncommon thing for a writer, after the use of a general expression, to employ particular terms illustrative of the general expression, just in the same way the Apostle does in that passage.

The strongest objection I know against this view is, that which is founded upon Gal. iv. 13, 14. But we have no certain evidence for concluding that the Apostle here refers to bodily infirmity. The words may appropriately enough be considered as referring to the trials and persecutions to which he was exposed in renouncing Judaism, and in preaching the Gospel. So Beza, δι' ἀσθενείαν τῆς σαρκός—Id est, per varias afflictiones, quibus quotidie exercebatur Apostolus, adeo ut nihil esset illo abjectius si externam speciem, atque adeo si hominem spectes. This view is strengthened, I think, by the connection. The Apostle exhorts them to be as he was, that is, that they should repudiate every principle of Judaism as he had done. This would expose them

to

to trouble as in his own case ; but this, he goes on to say, did not at one time damage him in their estimation, for they had received him as an angel of God, and manifested for him an extraordinary warmth of affection.

ANALECTA BIBLICA.

LAMECH.

(Gen. iv. 19-20).—In going through the list of Cain's descendants, we find nothing to arrest our attention till we come to Lamech, who was the fifth in descent from Cain, and who must have been born soon before the death of Seth and the birth of Enoch—six hundred years from the Creation.* This Lamech seems to have been a very remarkable person, and out of seven verses devoted to the posterity of Cain, six are occupied by the sayings and doings of him and his two sons. Reserving the sons for separate notice, let us give our present attention to Lamech himself. The record concerning him is singular, striking, and abrupt. It comprises poetry, rhetoric, and history ; and yet, although it suggests much, and sets the mind to work, there is little in it to satisfy the curiosity it excites.

'First, we are informed that Lamech had *two* wives, called Adah and Zillah—beautiful names, and the first female names that occur since Eve. Why is this fact so pointedly mentioned, unless to intimate that the practice of having more than one wife was a new thing, and among the inventions of the house of Cain ? This is the general sentiment of antiquity ; and the early Christian writers who have occasion to allude to the matter, agree with Tertullian in regarding Lamech as the first man who reversed the order of nature and of creation, by taking two wives unto himself.

'Adah bore to Lamech two sons, Jabal and Jubal, and by Zillah he had one, named Tubal-Cain—all famous inventors, of whom there will be more to say anon. "And the sister of Tubal-Cain was Naamah." This is all we hear of *her*. It is remarkable that her name should be found at all in a record in which the names of so few women are preserved ; and it is still more remarkable that it is given without any circumstances to indicate the cause of its insertion. The name means *fair* or *beautiful*. Was her beauty her distinction ? Did that beauty produce effects by which great families were united or broken ? Beauty has, within the compass of historical time, moved the world. Did it, in her person, shake the old world also ? Her brothers were the great fathers of social arts. Was her fame of the same sort as theirs ? Some ascribe to her the invention of spinning and weaving ; and others, who find in her brother the Vulcan of the Greeks, recognise in her Minerva,

* This is according to the common or shorter chronology, which, as that in general use, we feel bound to follow in a work of this kind, although strongly persuaded, with most scholars, that the larger chronology, as preserved in the Septuagint version, is more correct.

who had among her names that of Nemanoun.^b But all this is bald conjecture. Her name was Naamah; her father was Lamech; her brother Tubal-Cain; she lived—she died. This is all we know of her. To what she owed her fame—a fame of six thousand years—must remain inscrutable. As one finds among the ruins of time some old gray monument, too important and distinguished to have been constructed for a person of mean note, but discovers thereon only *A NAME*, which the rust of ages has left unconsumed—so it is with Lamech's illustrious daughter.

'Lamech had his troubles, as a man with two wives was likely to have, and always has had; but whether his troubles grew out of his polygamy is not clearly disclosed. We know them only through an address which he makes to his two wives. The subject-matter of this address is hard to be understood; but there is no mistaking as to its form, which embodies the parallelism and other characteristics of Hebrew poesy. This is the most ancient piece of poetry in the world; the only scrap of verse that has come to us from the ages before the flood. Is its production intended, by an actual specimen, to indicate that, as one of his sons was the father of music, so was he the father of poetry? At any rate, the actual utterance of verse by the father shows that, as we might expect, poetry was invented before music. Perhaps the former even originated the latter. What more probable than that the first efforts of the tuneful Jubal were made in giving the sweet voice of music to his father's harmonious numbers?

'The lines have been variously translated. We give them thus:—

"Adah and Zillah, hear my voice!
Wives of Lamech receive my speech!
If I slew a man to my wounding,
And a young man to my hurt:
If Cain was avenged seven times,
Then Lamech seventy times seven."

This is not very plain as to the meaning—but we can only imitate the admitted obscurity of the original. To what do these words refer? Almost every possible sense which they can by any translation or interpretation be construed to bear, has been assigned to them by different commentators. The Jewish tradition preserved in the Midrash is founded upon the mention of Cain, and upon the interpretation (which the best Jewish interpreters allow to be unfounded) that the promise to Cain was not that vengeance should be exacted sevenfold upon any one that slew him, but that vengeance should not be taken until the seventh generation—which generation Lamech represented. The story runs that Lamech, being blind (to account for his not seeing "the mark" upon Cain), slew his ancestor with a dart or arrow, under the direction of his son Tubal-Cain, who took the movements made by Cain, lurking in the woods, for those of some beast. But when the truth was seen, Lamech, in his horror at the deed, slew the son whose misdirection had brought this crime upon his soul. His son was thus "the young man" to whom the verse refers. Now it is true that it was

^b Plutarch, *de Iside et Osiride*.

not promised to Cain that he should never be slain—but that, if he were slain, sevenfold vengeance should be exacted for him. But for the rest, it is not likely that blind men went a hunting even before the Deluge: and the story has other improbabilities too numerous to need indication. No more need be said.

‘Josephus did not receive this tradition, if it existed in his time. He gives a favourable turn to the whole matter, observing, that Lamech, who saw as far as any man into the course and method of Divine justice, felt great concern in the prospect of that judgment which he apprehended to hang over his family for the murder of Abel; and under the force of that apprehension spoke of the matter to his wives. It is on this hint that Shuckford, followed by others, appears to have founded his view of these verses. He thinks that the death of Abel had occasioned a complete alienation between the family of Seth and that of Cain—who, although living apart, were kept in constant apprehension that a bloody vengeance would some day be exacted; but that Lamech, when he came to be the head of a people, sought to reason them out of their apprehensions by the argument contained in his words: understood to mean—if sevenfold vengeance were denounced upon the slayer of Cain, who murdered his own brother, there must surely be a far sorer punishment for those who may attempt to destroy any of us on the same account. The fault of this is that it is too vague and hypothetical, and has not a sufficiently pointed application to the words of the text.

‘It is an ingenious thought of some that the wives of Lamech took alarm at the invention of more formidable weapons than had hitherto been seen, by Tubal-Cain, and fancied that they might be some day employed against his life; but that he here comforts them by the assurance that, as he had never shed the blood of man, no one had an interest in destroying him.

‘On the other hand, many have thought that he had slain not only one but two (“a man,” and “a young man”), and that, considering how Cain had enhanced his crime and punishment by obdurate concealment, he here openly avows his crime, and contritely confesses himself a greater sinner than Cain.

‘Our own impression, coinciding with that of Lowth, is that Lamech had slain in self-defence some man by whom he had been assaulted and wounded. His wives would apprehend the exaction of blood-revenge by the friends of the man who had been slain, on which he puts his justifiable homicide on the proper footing by contrasting it with the murder committed by Cain, and urges that the difference of the offence rendered the danger of vengeance in his case but small. If the life of Cain were protected by the penalty of sevenfold vengeance, surely his by seventy times seven.’—*Daily Bible Illustrations*.

DE WETTE.—We do not know of a theologian and biblical critic in whose works there is so much to admire, and at the same time so much to censure, as in those of De Wette. His translation of the Bible is perhaps without a rival; his history of Christian Ethics is the best extant; his commentary on the Romans is one of the happiest specimens of

of neat, succinct, learned annotations, and his Commentary on the Psalms, though of a mixed character, contains much that is excellent. But in the work before us, in his Introductions to the Scriptures, and in his other writings of a similar tendency, we are met with a scepticism of the most appalling character. At one time we are delighted with the fullness and the exactness of his erudition, the acuteness of his intellect, and the justness of his views; at another, finding ourselves enveloped in mist, and in an artificial network of sophistical refinements and distinctions, we long for the clear light of a cloudless day, and for the freedom and simplicity of nature. How a mind can, in general, be so felicitous in its views, so surpassingly excellent, and yet so thoroughly vitiated at times, is more than we can comprehend. Should we attempt a complete and faithful delineation of both these features of our author's intellectual character, we should only be rewarded with incredulity.—(*American Christian Review*).

RELIGIONS OF THE WORLD.—In the whole world there are—

Jews . . .	4,000,000	or	5,000,000
Christians . .	228,000,000		299,000,000
Mohammedans .	100,000,000		110,000,000
Heathens . . .	405,000,000		463,000,000
	<hr/>		<hr/>
	737,000,000		877,000,000
Of whom there are under Christian rule . .			387,788,000
„ Mohammedan . .			72,000,000
„ Heathen . . .			277,000,000
			<hr/>
			737,000,000
Of Protestant States there are . . .	193,624,000	inhabitants.	
Roman Catholic . . .	134,164,000	„	
Greek . . .	60,000,000	„	
	<hr/>		<hr/>
	387,788,000		

NEUE'S *Repertorium für die Theologische Literatur*.

THOLUCK.—It is unnecessary for us to say much in respect to the character and writings of Dr. Tholuck. The American reader, if he has paid any attention to the theological literature of the day, must have formed some acquaintance with this distinguished author. His commentaries have very obvious defects as well as excellencies. He protrudes his philological stores too much. There is a redundancy of Greek and Latin quotations. The meaning of the sacred text is sometimes buried under a mass of learned reference. The comments of third-rate writers are quoted and refuted. Tholuck's rabbinical knowledge is sometimes a snare to him. Vast stores of erudition are lodged in his capacious memory, which he has not always the self-denial to withhold. Another fault, resulting perhaps in part from what has just been specified, is a want of logical consecutiveness in his thoughts. In the

the explanation of passages of Scripture, which involve processes of reasoning, we are furnished with philology where we need logic, with classical or oriental learning where we are in want of lucid arrangement and well weighed expressions. In this species of exegesis, Calvin is perhaps unrivalled. L. J. Rückert is also a conspicuous example. Tholuck, in company with not a few of his countrymen, is too apt to run into a vein of religious sentimentalism. Certain phrases and allusions are used which are on the boundary line between poetry and prose. They are well enough if employed sparingly. But we soon tire of "still midnight," "silent stars," "gray dawn," "depths of the spirit," and the like.

Tholuck's excellencies are equally conspicuous. His cast of character and temperament in some respects qualify him in a high degree for an interpreter of the Gospels. He has remarkable affinities to what are commonly regarded as the characteristics of the beloved disciple. That gentle, susceptible, tender frame of spirit, which he possesses, fits him admirably to comment on such passages as the eleventh chapter of the Gospel of John. This multifarious learning also is frequently turned to the best account. It imparts great freshness to his expositions. His illustrations, drawn from this source, are not unfrequently of the happiest kind. He has likewise no small share of critical tact.

The true meaning of a text is perceived with that species of intuition which a practised and able Biblical critic acquires. We feel also the utmost confidence in his moral integrity, in his sincere love of divine truth, and in his superiority to sinister motives.—(*American*) *Christian Review*.

CONFUSION OF TONGUES.—The great antiquity of Babel or Babylon is established by the fact that Nimrod was its chief. It formed a centre from which population proceeded in all directions. The dispersion is, in the style of the author, described as an act of God, and as meant to confound their language or speech. Like other acts of the Creator, it is mingled with supreme wisdom and beneficence. Thus, if man had used only one language, there would in all probability have arisen among them only one poet of the description styled epic. He having occupied the field both of illustration and of fame, all others would have been discouraged. There might have been a Greek Homer, but there would have been no Latin Virgil. Or, take the case in reference to modern times. England, Spain, Portugal, Italy, or France, might have had one great writer of that description, but the first would have prevented competition by others, the language being the same: whereas the human mind has been exerted and improved in a high degree by the variety of similar exertions resulting from the variety of languages. The principle might be illustrated by reference to various departments of intellectual exertion. Thus it has been said, that the extraordinary eminence of Sir Isaac Newton discouraged for a time in England mathematical studies, because it was felt that all must be eclipsed by his renown. Language itself, being the chief organ of intellect,

intellect, and thereby a most valuable interpreter of its constitution, is at once an important instrument in active life, and a subject for profound investigation; but the principles on which it is formed could never have been very competently understood without the existence of a variety of languages. — FORSYTH'S *Observations on Genesis and Exodus*.

THE LAW OF MEATS.—It would be quite unreasonable to expect that, destitute as we are of any contemporaneous comment, we should be able at this distant time fully and precisely to explain a class of regulations having reference to the tastes, the prejudices, and the physical well-being of a people under peculiar circumstances, and to those habits of private life of which history is not accustomed to take note. It is probable that many of them were intended merely to promote a uniformity of domestic usages, and a decency of manners, according to the most approved standard of the time and place. A remark which has been made in a more general form holds good, especially in respect to the distinction of practices and tastes as to food. In their origin they are in a great measure arbitrary, but they constitute a rule which it is a violation of good sense and good manners, and one's own sense of propriety to infringe. A French soldier will easily eat horseflesh, and would eat it oftener if it were not too dear; a thing which a German will hardly be induced to do in any emergency. The thought of eating frogs and snails disgusts most of us who have not tasted them. They make, however, the choice and costly luxury of the Parisian *cuisine*, the best in the world. We should loathe the sight of a dog upon our tables; a Sandwich islander cannot set out his ceremonious feast without it. The rat often feasts upon the best of our granaries, while we keep the swine for our scavenger; yet we could not endure the flesh of the former, while that of the latter is reckoned a delicacy. Now whatever might have been the standard in this respect, to which old custom, originating in whatever accident had given an approved authority among the Israelites, to that standard for reasons which have been urged, it was a legitimate and important object of the Jewish law to enforce a uniform adherence. If the eating, for instance, of camels or hares, of mice or of tortoises, which are among the prohibited articles, was, according to the best current sentiment of the nation, a violation of delicacy and good breeding, there was a good reason why a legislator who aimed at the civilization of the people should expressly forbid it to any who might otherwise be tempted to forfeit their self-respect by indulging appetite at the expense of decorum.—PALFREY'S *Academical Lectures on the Jewish Scriptures*.

QUOTATIONS OF THE FATHERS.—On the subject of the quotations of the Fathers, I have thought it might be worth while to add the testimony of the three last principal editors of the New Testament, Griesbach, Matthæi, and Scholz, and of Eichhorn himself. Griesbach says of Origen, on whose quotation he so much relies, that “in the same work,
at

at the distance of a few pages, he sometimes quotes the same passage from the New Testament in a different manner ;” and that the same uncertainty in his quotations appears, as might be expected, in his different works, when compared together. ‘I freely admit,’ he says, ‘that Origen did not always examine his manuscript when he was about to quote a passage from Scripture, but sometimes trusted to his memory, whence throughout his works the construction of passages is altered ; one synonymous word is substituted for another ; articles, particles, and prepositions are omitted, with other similar changes, that for the most part do not affect the sense. I admit further, that it was not always his purpose to adduce the very words and syllables of a passage, but that, according to the object he had in view, he sometimes altered, omitted, or added, or even expressed the sense only of the sacred writer, in his own style and words.’

I have already quoted a passage in which Griesbach says of another of his principal Alexandrine authorities, Clement, that, ‘he not unfrequently cites from memory, and gives rather the sense than the words of the sacred writers.’ Matthæ, after adducing one example in which Clement has blended together incorrectly the words of two different verses, says there are a thousand other similar passages in his writings ; and adds (alluding to Griesbach)—‘When I say a *thousand*, I speak not from Scripture, as others do who make him a chief authority of the Alexandrine recension, but from well-grounded knowledge.’

Matthæ observes, that those quotations of the Greek fathers are most to be regarded which are to be found in their commentaries ; but affirms that, when these are appended to the original text, the readings found in the commentary not unfrequently differ from those of the text. He says that Origen often arbitrarily alters passages to conform them to his fanciful expositions ; and that Chrysostom repeats the same passage several times with different variations in a single homily. Of quotations found in other writings than professed commentaries, he says that, as far as he is acquainted with them, ‘the Greek Fathers, generally and particularly, used little or no care to quote passages of the New Testament, as they found them in their manuscripts ; hence it is common for them to be inconsistent with themselves ; and they also quote the same passage falsely in different places, either through accident or design. Scholz says, ‘The Fathers were accustomed to quote the Scriptures from memory, without inspecting their manuscripts, so that we can very seldom be certain whether their citations faithfully represent the text of those manuscripts, or whether the various readings found in their works owed their origin to lapses of memory and indolence. Sometimes they compress a long passage ; sometimes paraphrase a short one ; and sometimes give the meaning rather than the precise words of a passage, as it occurred to their recollection, in a form adapted to the occasion ; so that they quote the same passage differently in different places.’ In treating of the criticism of the text of the New Testament, Eichhorn says, ‘Concerning the value and trustworthiness of the quotations of the Fathers, many doubts arise. Did not *the Church* designedly alter many passages to conform

conform them to orthodoxy; and have not the Fathers adopted such alterations? Do not the Fathers often quote the same passage differently in different parts of their works? In their citations, do they not regard the sense more than the words? Hence do they not often paraphrase the passage which it is their purpose to adduce? Do they not often trust to their memory in quoting? And did not the habit often lead them to blend together different passages and combine them into one? Certainly these are facts which cannot be denied; but still the quotations of the Fathers are not all without use in the criticism of the text.—NORTON, *On the Genuineness of the Gospels*.

SYMBOLICAL RODS.—*The Lord said unto Jeremiah, 'What hast thou seen?' 'I see a rod of an almond-tree.' 'Thou hast seen well; for I will hasten my word to perform it' (Jer. i. 11, 12).*—Here the rod of an *almond-tree* must be regarded as an acknowledged and well known symbol of *hastening* or *speed*, for the accomplishment of the divine purpose with speed is to correspond with such an intimation given by the *symbol*. See also the apologue of Jotham (Judges ix.), where the *olive-tree*, the *fig-tree*, the *vine*, and *bramble*, are described as the symbols of things; observe also the apologue of Jehoshaphat (2 Kings xiv. 9).

From these and similar passages it may be inferred that certain trees and rods, or staves or branches taken from them, were considered as means of information, or as the symbols of distinct ideas; and therefore they were constituted the general badges of certain offices, especially such as implied a sacredness of character. Hence the sceptres of kings; the rods of priests, ambassadors, and magistrates; the rod of Moses, of Aaron, of the Egyptian magicians, &c.

These *rods* were considered, not only as the emblems of power and of authority, but as the immediate means of executing them.

The rod of Moses is called the rod of God, and the Almighty tells him, 'Thou shalt take this *rod* in thine own hand, and *therewith* thou shalt do signs.' Accordingly we find Aaron lifting up his *rod* over the river, and it became blood; Moses lifting up his *rod* over the sea, and it was divided; Elisha giving his *staff* to Gehazi to lay on the face of a dead child, that he might revive.

So generally was the emblematical use of a *rod* or *staff* admitted, that the words themselves became synonymous to *power*, *commission*, *a message*, *a sentence*, and the like: and removing or breaking the rod or staff implied that authority was abrogated, and power destroyed. Thus, in Psalm cx., 'The Lord shall send the *rod* of thy power out of Sion: *be thou ruler even in the midst among thine enemies.*' Here the *rod* clearly implies a commission, as in Micah vi. 9 it imports a *decree*, 'Hear ye the *rod* and who hath appointed it.' Again, 'The Lord shall take away the *staff*, the mighty man, the man of war, the judge, the prophet, the prudent, the ancient,' &c. (Isa. iii. 1, 2). 'The Lord hath broken the *staff* of the wicked, and the sceptre of the rulers.' 'Moab is spoiled, and all ye that are about him bemoan him; and all ye that know his name say, How is the *strong staff* broken, and the beautiful

beautiful rod.' These forms of expression must have alluded necessarily to some established customs, they must be referred indispensably to some primitive system which regarded *rods*, *branches*, and *staves* as the symbols of certain ideas, and as 'the vehicles of messages, commissions, or the like.'^a So far the customs of the *old Asiatics* corresponded in their prevalence to those of *Druids* in Europe.

To this extent the device was innocent, but the heathens of *Asia*, as well as those of *Europe*, seem to have abused it for the purpose of divination, as we may collect from the following passages:—'My people ask counsel at their stocks, and their *staff declareth* unto them.' 'They sacrifice upon the tops of the mountains, and burn incense upon the hills, under *oaks*, and *poplars*, and *elms*, because the shadow thereof is good' (Hos. iv. 12, 13). Again (Isa. xix. 11—15), the prophet speaks of the wise men of Egypt being deceived in their divinations, and declares, 'Neither shall there be any work for Egypt, which the head or tail, branch or rush, may do.' Here is a manifest allusion, not merely to the implements of writing or of the geometrician, but evidently to a superstitious practice in which *rush* and *branch* were employed. *Ezekiel* terminates his climax of abominations by these words, 'Lo! they put the *branch* to their nose' (ch. viii. 17). Upon the whole, then, some general but evident analogies to the *symbolical* system thus intimated may be found in the sacred records, and carried back to very ancient periods.—DAVIES' *Celtic Researches*.

CORRESPONDENCE.

TEXTUAL CRITICISM OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

MY DEAR SIR,—You will not, I believe, object to my taking occasion, from the letter of your correspondent W. S., in your January Number, to bring before your readers some points connected with textual criticism.

I must, first, however thank W. S. for his remarks and criticisms. I am glad to receive any intelligent communications, from whatever quarter, on the critical principles laid down in my Prospectus. I wish to assure W. S. (who he may be is wholly unknown to me), and any others who may favour me with communications, whether direct or through the medium of your Journal, that I shall be thankful to take into my serious consideration whatever may be suggested as likely to improve either the plan that I have adopted, or the means of carrying out that plan into its details.

^a The *wands* carried by officers of state at our court, and at this very time, were adopted originally upon the same principle.

And

And now, to prevent all possibility of misconception, let me at once say that I make scarcely any claim to originality. I think that I have expressed as much in my Prospectus, and in the introduction to 'The Book of Revelation, translated from ancient authorities' (Bagsters, 1849). I have fully recognised the priority of Bentley's design, and of Lachmann's executed text, and also of Tischendorf's labours on ancient MSS. I have, however, shown (I believe) that there is sufficient reason for the work being carried on (and in this Lachmann fully concurs with me); and so, whether original or not, I occupy a portion of the critical field which has not as yet been altogether appropriated.

Lachmann's is not precisely a restored critical text, but it is (as he himself describes it) the result to which certain lines of evidence (using merely the common sources of information) ought to lead. To Lachmann I fully concede the credit of having led the way in rejecting the common text formed fortuitously from modern copies; although from the small measure of explanation given by himself, I was engaged in critical labours, and had adopted the principle of relying on ancient evidence before I rightly understood the plan of Lachmann's edition. The path by which I was led to adopt ancient authorities, and those only, was one wholly different from that of Lachmann; and though the result was in some respects the same, yet there remains the wide difference on two points. 1st, I do not restrict my witnesses so much as Lachmann does; I do not *confine* myself to the *oldest* MSS., though I consider them of the most weight; nor do I exclude all the versions except the Latin. I use the ancient versions in general as corroborative witnesses, as well as all the older Fathers. 2nd, I do not content myself with common sources of information, but I think it needful to do all that I can to collate the ancient MSS. *de novo*, so as, if possible, to ensure accuracy. I thus hope to present a text really formed on critical evidence.

Tischendorf, in both his Leipzig editions, has, in a great measure, followed the principle of adhering to the ancient authorities; but, as I showed, in reviewing his second Leipzig edition, he seems to me too often to adhere to readings not sufficiently upheld by the weight of ancient testimony. In collating MSS. he was my predecessor; I wish fully to acknowledge my obligation to him, and I believe that we have been able, by the mutual communication of our respective collations, to be of assistance one to another.

It may be found, then, that in my text I give but few readings which one or the other of these learned editors has not adopted before me. What then? I do not seek *originality*, but *TRUTH*; and so long as I may be of service in upholding the ancient text of God's Holy Word, I deem it to be of but little importance whether any credit attaches to myself. I shall at least give the *evidence* as fully as possible on which the ancient readings rest; and I shall neither adopt nor reject a reading because of the favourable opinion, or the contrary, of any critic. But still I consider that all readings which have been *adopted* by any critical editor are worthy of a repeated scrutiny.

I do

I do not know whither I shall satisfy W. S. in the use which I shall make of cursive MSS. I have collated 1 (at Basle) of the Gospels, and the MS (at Paris) designated 33 in the Gospels, 17 in St. Paul's Epistles. I should also use the readings of the MS. 38 in the Apocalypse, the readings of which I must take from Birch, except in a few places in which I examined it myself in the Vatican. Now these cursive MSS. bear indubitable proof of having been copied from ancient Codices; their text savours more of the fifth than the twelfth century. But, it may be asked, why select only these few? I reply, I should be indeed glad of trustworthy collations of some few others among the cursive MSS; there are none, however, of such importance as those which I have mentioned; and in taking my choice between using a *few* and using *none*, I chose the former alternative, especially because the MSS. 1 and 33 had not been properly collated by *any one* previously.

I wish distinctly to state that I perfectly agree with W. S. that 'the ultimate and proper object of criticism is to ascertain, not the state of the text of a work at any particular period of its history, but, as nearly as may be, the condition in which it was left by its author.' In specifying *the fourth century*, I pointed out the period back to which we can well go; we can show what licence of transcriptural alteration went on subsequently, and we can compare the witnesses of the fourth century with all evidence of every kind which takes us back yet farther. If we have no copies of the apostolic age, and we have the opportunity of choosing between the fourteenth century and the fourth, let us at least revert to the latter, and cast off all blind adherence to the so-called *textus receptus* of a thousand years later. How greatly does probability preponderate in favour of the one rather than of the other!

But while taking my stand on the fourth century, I am there prepared to show that very often certain documents lead us yet farther back. Thus, in the writings of Origen, we find still extant in Greek something like *two-thirds* of the whole New Testament; now, make what deduction we please for lax citation, it cannot be denied that the accordance of the ancient MSS. with Origen must so far carry us to the early part of the third century. Again, the old Latin version and the *Curetonian* Syriac belong almost undoubtedly to the second century. The general accordance of these versions with the oldest MSS. carries us, therefore, a long way farther; so that step by step we do actually approach the apostolic age.

Thus much in explanation of the manner in which I alluded to the fourth century. I would that in all cases we could go direct to the apostolic age.

The reference made by W. S. to the testimony of Quintilian, as to the commencement of Livy, is a good illustration of the cases in which we can revert to the oldest testimony. We ought, however, even in such cases to weigh well all considerations; a *casual* citation, differing from all other authorities, must not be allowed to have much weight, and even an express statement must be examined, for it may merely relate

relate to the copy used by the writer, and not to the copies in general. In some cases I think we need feel no doubt.

For instance, Irenæus, in speaking of Matt. i. 18, says (after having previously cited the words '*Christi autem generatio sic erat*'), '*Ceterum potuerat dicere Matthæus, Jesu vero generatio sic erat*; sed prævidens Spiritus Sanctus depravatores, et præmuniens contra fraudulentiam eorum per Matthæum ait: *Christi autem generatio sic erat*.' (Lib. iii. 16, 2). This is given in proof that Jesus and Christ are one and the same person, and that Jesus cannot be said to be the receptacle that afterwards received Christ.

Now, this reading might have been supposed to be one peculiar to Irenæus's copy of the Gospel; and even when it is found to be the lection supported by the old Latin copies, as well as by Jerome's Vulgate, it might still be considered as a reading current merely in the West: but even as such it would be entitled to great consideration. A farther testimony to this reading is supplied by the Syriac text of the Gospels discovered by Mr. Cureton, which reads ܕܡܝܬܐ ܕܡܝܬܐ ܕܡܝܬܐ. This therefore supplies us with a proof that this reading was not confined to the west.

But how do we stand as to MS authority? Now, to say nothing of the omission of 'Ιησοῦ in a cursive MS. (which I believe to be a mere casualty), we must at once own that this ancient reading is not found in any Greek copies which we possess. However, we can *prove* that this was the reading of one of our oldest Greek MSS. now defective in this passage. The first leaf of the Codex Bezae (D) is gone, but the readings are preserved in the *Latin text* on the opposite page; so that no one can reasonably doubt that that MS. omitted 'Ιησοῦ. Is not, then, the testimony of Irenæus sufficiently confirmed?

It must be borne in mind that transcribers *continually* added 'Ιησοῦς to Χριστός, and *vice versa*, from mere habit in associating the names. Here, while τοῦ δὲ 'Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ is the reading of the common text and of the MSS. in general, the Vatican MS. reads in a different order τοῦ δὲ Χριστοῦ 'Ιησοῦ; indeed the common order is hardly defensible, and only occurs in doubtful (or certainly erroneous) passages. It indicates a time when 'Ιησοῦς Χριστός had become a kind of united proper name.

Lachmann, indeed, refers to Origen iii. p. 965 *d* as an authority for the same reading as that found in the Vatican MS. The passage occurs in Jerome's *Latin* translation of Origen's twenty-eighth homily on St. Luke, where the words are '*Christi autem Jesu generatio sic erat*.' This is a doubtful ground for citing Origen's authority, especially as in the Greek fragments of this very homily we find the common reading.

In another place (Lib. iii. 11, 8) Irenæus cites the same text, and then it stands of course in the same form in the old Latin version. It is, however, a curious illustration of the manner in which transcribers have introduced into the writings of the Fathers readings with which they

they are familiar, that we find in the Greek text of this passage of Irenæus, as preserved in the citation of Germanus, Patriarch of Constantinople, the words cited as read in the common Greek copies: a reading which Irenæus expressly repudiates as any one can a reading of which he had never heard.

W. S. supposes that the early Christians had not the same belief in the plenary inspiration of Scripture as afterwards obtained currency. However, does not this passage show the feeling of Irenæus? He argues on the fact that the Spirit of God had seen fit to use the term *Christ*, and not in that passage *Jesus Christ*. I am not concerned to defend the term 'verbal inspiration,' but I do defend the idea and thought which I connect with that term; if there be a better technical expression, let it be introduced. Is it not plain that, in the second century, the Christians believed that the words in which Holy Scripture is expressed were not accidental, but designed of God? I believe undoubtedly that the Holy Ghost ruled the mental faculties of the inspired writers, so that they used such words as He saw to be the best to express the thoughts conveyed. It is thus that Scripture is ever used in all matters of doctrinal argument. No one who values the authority of the Bible, and knows the preciousness of the evangelical truths there taught, feels himself at liberty to alter the words in which Holy Scripture has been given.

The remark also of Irenæus on the number of the beast (Rev. xiii. 18), shows that he deemed the wilful alteration of a letter of Scripture to be a sin; else he could not say that he thought that God would forgive those who had introduced the reading 606, instead of 666, if they had done it only inadvertently.

I grant that Origen and others notice variations in the Greek copies then in use, but this statement must not be applied too widely, for the passages thus spoken of by Origen are really very few; they are, however, of no small importance, for when he says that some copies read *thus*, and some *thus*, he puts us in the same position as to evidence, as we should be if we had the copies themselves before us.

I now proceed to the point in W. S.'s letter to which he appears to attach particular importance—the internal evidence in favour of a reading as deduced from its goodness.

I quite admit that this canon has its place, while I believe there are few principles on which there is more danger of our acting wrongly. An easy reading, where all seems plain and simple, often gives the uncritical reader the idea of goodness. I do not class W. S. amongst such, for I think that he has evidently studied the subject on which he writes. *Proclivi lectioni præstat ardua* was the excellent rule laid down by Bengel, and this very rule often guides in determining the critical value of different readings on the score of internal goodness.

In all cases the evidence must first stand: then, in cases of conflicting evidence, all other considerations must have their place; for internal goodness must never be allowed to prevail in opposition to evidence. In the three former Gospels a passage may be found in which there are several readings; of these some accord precisely with
the

the parallel passage in the other Gospels, while others (well supported) differ. In such a case the latter ought to be preferred.

A reading is often well supported by evidence, and yet it seems to afford no sense. In such a case let it be well considered whether this is *really* the case or not; if it were so, it would show that transcribers and translators had combined in transmitting something void of meaning: the supposition is *possible*, of course, but in a high degree improbable.

On this subject I may be allowed to quote a passage from my Introduction to 'The Book of Revelation, translated from Ancient Authorities' (p. vi).

I there said :—

'A striking instance how traditional misapprehension may cause a reading to be judged unintelligible, is shown in 2 Tim. iv. 1. The ancient authorities, instead of *κατὰ τὴν ἐπιφ.* read *καὶ τὴν ἐπιφ.* Many have supposed that with this reading no sense could be given to the verse. But all this difficulty has been caused by the false rendering traditionally ascribed to *δαμαρτύρομαι*, which is far more fitly rendered, especially in such a connection, by "I testify," than by "I charge." See Acts xx. 21 and 24 (of course it is fully admitted that such a phrase as "I testify *that*" such a thing should be done, may be equivalent in its ultimate bearing to "I charge *that*"). "Thee" has been supplied in translation, as supposing Timothy to be addressed.

'The verse in question stands thus in the older Greek and Latin authorities (the words *ὅν ἐγὼ* and *τοῦ κυρίου* are admitted not to be genuine):—

Δαμαρτύρομαι ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ μέλλοντος κρίνειν ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς, καὶ τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ.

'Testificor coram Deo et Christo Jesu, qui judicaturus est vivos ac mortuos, et adventum ipsius et regnum ejus.

'I testify in the presence of God, and of Christ Jesus, who is to judge the quick and dead, both of His appearing and His kingdom.

'The sense is simple, very different, however, from that which has been attached to the *modern* readings of the verse; but nothing has hindered the sense from being at once perceived except traditional notions.'

W. S. refers very suitably to Griesbach, as one who had a good apprehension of the value of internal goodness in a reading. It must also, however, be borne in mind that Griesbach denied most strenuously that any reading ought to be adopted on the ground of its internal goodness unless, indeed, it were supported by at least some ancient testimony.

But internal coherence has great value in cases of real conflict of evidence. Thus, in Acts xii. 24, we read in some copies (such as B G H) 'Saul and Barnabas returned *εἰς* Ἱερουσαλήμ, *unio* Jerusalem'; others again read (with the common text) *ἐξ* Ἱερ., *from* Jerusalem (a reading which in other copies is varied into *ἀπὸ* Ἱερ.). Now, as Saul and Barnabas had gone *to* Jerusalem, and as this transaction, whatever it was, took place when they had fulfilled their mission, the internal evidence in favour of the reading *ἐξ* *from* Jerusalem is most strong.

In 1 Cor. xv. 51, there are three readings, which are not only found in copies still extant, but which we can trace back to a very early period, since the variation is stated by Jerome and Origen as even then found in the copies. The three readings in the main are these :—

I. πάντες

- I. Πάντες οὐ κοιμηθσόμεθα, πάντες δὲ ἀλλαγησόμεθα.
- II. Πάντες κοιμηθσόμεθα, οὐ πάντες δὲ ἀλλαγησόμεθα.
- III. Πάντες ἀναστησόμεθα, οὐ πάντες δὲ ἀλλαγησόμεθα.
- I. We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed.
- II. We shall all sleep, but we shall not all be changed.
- III. We shall all rise, but we shall not all be changed.

The external evidence still extant for each of these readings (especially, perhaps, the second) is very strong. We may, however, go back to early testimony; and we have, in fact, on this ground as good means of forming a judgment as if we lived in the third century.

Which, then, of the readings possesses the best claim on internal grounds? To my mind the first, decidedly; because the connection is such that the Apostle speaks immediately of the ἡμεῖς who will *not* sleep, but will be changed when the trumpet sounds at the coming of the Lord. I may add that this reading has the excellent authority of B (the Vatican MS.). Tischendorf, indeed, merely cites *B e silentio collatorum*; but to this I can add my own testimony, for I remember having read this passage in the MS. itself. A misapprehension seems to have arisen as to the force of πάντες οὐ κοιμηθσόμεθα, as though it meant 'none of us will sleep' (just as πᾶς, followed by a negative, is sometimes in N. Test. Greek equal to οὐδεὶς); it is no wonder that the negative was transposed to avoid this apparently impossible statement. In one place Origen reads οὐ πάντες κοιμ. (I. 589 f), so as to connect the negative with the whole sentence.

Perhaps these examples may illustrate the use that I would make of internal goodness in forming an estimate of reading.

And now to meet the particular reading noticed by W. S., ἔχωμεν or ἔχωμεν, in Rom. v. 1. I concede fully that the common reading of the modern printed text gives a good sense: 'Having been justified by faith, *we have* peace with God,' I may even admit that this reading looks at first sight superior to the other in which the subjunctive mood is found. And yet I doubt on internal grounds whether the reading preferred by W. S. will, *when all is fully considered*, be proved to be internally the better.

How can we render the subjunctive reading ἔχωμεν? Now, with all deference to W. S.'s scholarship, I think he has not given it its *full* meaning. I refer, as an authority, to Mr. Green, in his admirable 'Treatise on the Grammar of the New Testament Dialect.' He says (p. 40) of the subjunctive mood, 'One point of its usage remains to be noticed here, namely, what is called its deliberative sense, when it is equivalent to the English auxiliary *ought*.' This idea is what I would here introduce. 'Having been justified by faith, *we ought* to have peace with God.' The sinner who believes in Christ is justified; he can say, 'The surety has died in my stead; He has borne my sins, they are put away; I am accepted, as trusting in Him, in His perfect righteousness; the Holy Ghost is a witness to this, for He has quickened me to believe in Christ, and made me to know the love of God in sending His Son.' Thus, having been justified by faith, we ought

to have peace with God.' The result is expressed far more strongly than if the mere fact had been enunciated. How fully, too, does this accord with other parts of the argument, 'God commendeth His love towards us, in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us; much more, therefore, having now been justified by His blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him; for if when we were enemies we were reconciled to God through the death of His Son, much more, having been reconciled, we shall be saved by His life'? On such considerations as these does the thought of ἔχομεν rest. I do not quite agree with the opinion of W. S., who seems (if I apprehend him rightly) to exclude the application of the expression 'Peace with God' to the conscious feeling. I quite own that it describes a state into which the justified person is brought, but that it also applies to the *conscious knowledge* of that state is shown by the expression, 'Peace be multiplied;' the state or condition of those saluted thus is the same, only the Apostle desires that their conscious apprehension of peace may increase and abound.

The deliberative subjunctive implies the fact that we have peace—and more, also, that we should have it as a conscious possession; casting away that distrust which resulted from our hearts having been at enmity against God.

The use of the deliberative subjunctive is shown in that reading of 1 Cor. xv. 49, which is supported by most MS. authority (all the Uncial MSS. except B, of which we do not here know the reading, certainly), 'as we have borne the image of the earthy, φορέσωμεν we ought also to bear the image of the heavenly.' The mere future would not express nearly as much; this should follow from the other as a consequence; as in virtue of our connection as men with the first Adam we partake of his earthy nature, so ought we as believers, in virtue of our connection with Christ the second Adam, to be partakers of what He is as heavenly. A denier of the resurrection of course denied this.

I add a remark on the evidence for ἔχομεν in Rom. v. 1, as restated by W. S. It requires some deductions, for F and G are copies of the *same* MS.; their authority is therefore *overstated*, if we say 'two out of the eight principal MS. authorities.' Farther, no account is taken of my remark that in these MSS. 'o and ω are so *habitually* confounded that they have but little weight on *such* a point.' In G the interlined version 'habeamus' seems to indicate that the Greek subjunctive reading was intended, for the version is not a mere copy of the Vulgate. Put, then, the case of MS. evidence at the strongest, and all that we can say is, that *one* ancient authority *may* support the reading ἔχομεν. The corrector of B is the comparatively modern hand that has retouched the letters: this, therefore, cannot belong to ancient evidence.

Then as to versions, let it be observed, I only cited from the authorities stated by Tischendorf, just as he gave them, without stopping to question them. Now, Tischendorf merely took the versions which were not cited *against* ἔχομεν as being necessarily in its favour. Non omnia

omnia possumus omnes. Tischendorf is a great collator, but he has very little knowledge of his own of the ancient versions. The Hareclean Syriac certainly appears to read ἔχομεν; of the Slavonic I can say nothing, because I know nothing; but as to the Æthiopic, 'venerable (as W. S. says) for its antiquity,' it is in this place, as in so many others, such a weak and dreary paraphrase as to have scarcely any verbal authority in a question of various readings. Bode thus renders the sentence: 'Justificamini ergo per fidem et *acquiramus* pacem apud Dominum, (per) Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum.' I do not think that *this* can be deemed an authority for ἔχομεν. I leave it, however, as a mere paraphrase, in which the translator cared little enough about making verbal changes.

Had Chrysostom known anything of the reading ἔχομεν, and had he believed it genuine, he might have spared himself the investigation τί ἐστιν 'εἰρήνην ἔχομεν'?

I trust that I have sufficiently stated my views on these points brought forward by W. S.: I shall always be glad of such criticisms as may further the object which I have in view.

Punctuation is a subject which requires much attention; the unnecessary insertion of stops often obscures the sense, and hinders a reader from forming as clear a judgment as a schoolboy would, who merely construed according to rule.

Many passages would be made more intelligible by the proper introduction of parenthesis marks; when words which appear to depend on what has gone before, *wait*, as it were, till the end of the sentence, it is only by parenthesis that the matter can be made clear to the eye. See, for example, the parenthesis marked in our English version in 1 Peter, iii. 21. Similarly I would read in 2 Peter, i. 13, ὡς λόγων φαίν. . . . φωσφ. ἀναρείλη, as a parenthesis; thus connecting 'whereunto ye do well to take heed' with 'in your hearts.' The meaning of this verse, as commonly pointed, I do not see; the day-star surely does not arise in our hearts, and, even if this were explained, how can we take heed to the word of prophecy *till* then?

In Rom. viii. 20, I would introduce a parenthesis, so as to include οὐχ ἐκούσα ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα: 'The creation was made subject to vanity (not willingly, but in consequence of him who hath subjected it) in expectancy, because the creation itself also shall be set free,' etc.

Rom. ix. 1, I would point and connect thus: 'I say the truth in Christ, and lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost, that I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart (for I have wished my own self to be accursed from Christ), for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh.'

This passage has been already *much* discussed in your Journal; in this and in 2 Peter, i. 19, I only follow some printed Greek Testaments. Rom. ix. 1, appears to me to be thus made clear: St. Paul had 'sorrow in his heart for his brethren;' he did not wish to be accursed from Christ for them; the thing was impossible in itself, and

the Holy Ghost could not bear witness to any such awful (I might say blasphemous) thought. He had this sorrow for his brethren, for he knew their condition; he could look at the time when he hated the very name of Christ; a time when he used to wish himself as far from Christ as possible; in fact, in a state which he now knew to be that of one wishing himself 'accursed from Christ.' He felt for his brethren all the more acutely, for he had been in the same condition. The parenthesis makes the passage, in my opinion, clear enough.

I may be allowed here to suggest a punctuation of the much discussed passage 1 Cor. xv. 29, which *may* remove the difficulty in some minds. In the end of the verse all the best authorities read *αὐτῶν*, instead of *τῶν νεκρῶν*. Perhaps the verse may be thus connected and pointed:—

'Else what shall they do who are baptized? (It is) for the dead, if the dead rise not at all; why then are they baptized for them?'

This appears to me to be evidently the thought which Tertullian, Theodoret, and Chrysostom connected with the passage. We may exclude from our consideration the phrase 'baptized for the dead,' and we have no need to inquire what 'baptism for the dead' may mean if we only place the interrogation after 'baptized.' Baptism implies death *and* resurrection; if there be no resurrection, why any baptism? For then a man would be 'planted in the likeness of Christ's death,' without anything, in fact, to answer to Christ's resurrection. It would be, if the dead rise not, a meaningless rite, leading onward to death, and no farther.

I believe that I have from time to time sufficiently explained *what* my critical materials are, and how employed by me. As to the Armenian version, I wish to inform your readers that I have been thoroughly disappointed by the scholar in Germany who proposed to me to supply me with a collation of Zohrab's edition.*

I was similarly disappointed as to a comparison of the variations of Mr. Platt's edition of the Æthiopic with the Latin rendering of that version published by Bode.

There are some very valuable Palimpsest fragments amongst the Nitrian MSS. in the British Museum, to which Mr. Cureton has kindly called my attention; these will, of course, take their proper place amongst critical authorities.

To each Book of the New Testament a brief introduction ought to be prefixed, showing what the authorities are which contain it, and how far it is cited by the earlier Fathers, and that whether in commentaries or merely casually. *This* appears to me to be indispensable, for thus alone can the reader form a right apprehension of the condition of the evidence as to each particular part of the volume.

As to the early Fathers, it is my intention to give the references explicitly as to each citation, as far as Eusebius inclusive. This will bring in the important period as to *evidence*, and it is only on parti-

* Since writing the above I have met with a scholar who will, I believe, kindly undertake this collation.

cular occasions that we can need to go much farther down, unless, indeed, we wish *minutely* to trace the alterations made in the text by the unhappy diligence of transcribers.

By the time this letter meets the public eye my *specimen pages* and proposals for publication will also be in circulation. As I may thus refer to those specimen pages, it may save me a considerable quantity of previous explanation. It will be for others to decide how far I have succeeded in making intelligible both to the eye and the understanding what the balance of evidence is, what testimonies support, and what oppose, each particular reading.

I cannot conclude this letter without expressing my thankfulness that the Lord has graciously enabled me, in spite of many hindrances, to carry on my labour thus far; and I trust that I may regard this as an earnest that all that is needed may be provided for the entire accomplishment of what I have before me.

London, March 11th, 1851.

S. PRIDEAUX TREGELLES.

TENSES OF HEBREW VERBS.

*The Rectory, Barley, Herts, Oct. 14, 1850.**

DEAR SIR,—I am not sorry that Mr. (now Professor) Weir has deemed it right to defend his scheme of the Hebrew tenses, as in your last Number,—although I am, that he has thought it worth his while to be angry with me,—because I have no doubt good will be the result. I have, therefore, considered it a duty to follow him in this first particular; to do so in the second would be useless. And, as it is my wish to be as short as I can, I will, with your permission, proceed without further preface to the subject before us.

In the first place, then, I had said that Mr. Weir *had ploughed with my heifer*. This he denies, and affirms that the said heifer is not mine, but that I had stolen her from another. This is a grave charge, and evinces a disposition bent upon something beyond the mere defensive. Let us see how it is grounded.

Mr. Weir's words are:—'But the truth is, I do not admit Dr. Lee's claim to be the original discoverer of this Hebrew usage . . . it is not his.' We then have a quotation from the second edition of Dr. Robertson's Hebrew Grammar, in which his view of the *relative* use of the tenses is given. I need not give it because it can be seen in page 485 of your last Number. Mr. Weir continues: 'Now here we have the very principle which Dr. Lee insists is his and his only. It is plain it once belonged to Dr. Robertson.'

I remark, it is marvellous to conceive how Mr. Weir could have allowed himself to say this. For, first, I had not said a single word on the *relative* use of the tenses to which this quotation relates; and, if I had, this would have been any thing but determining the *principle* which governs the tenses. How Mr. Weir could have said that 'we have here *the very principle*,' &c., is to me quite inexplicable. But

* This letter was in type for the last Number of the Journal of Sacred Literature, but was, with much other matter, omitted for want of room.

the fact is, the principle adopted by Dr. Robertson, and governing his tenses, is that of Koolhaas as adopted also by Schröderus and others; and is totally different from mine, as I shall presently show. Koolhaas took his theory, as it should seem, from De Bruin: while he might quite as readily have taken it from John Buxtorf. It is briefly this:—the tenses are assumed to be two, *the preterite* and *the future*: and the rule of their application is, that which tense soever of these takes the lead, the following one, whether of the same tense, formally or not, is to be considered as *converted* into the same time; and, when these tenses happen to be connected by the conjunction *et*, *and*, it is then to be termed the *relative*, not the *conversive*, *vaw*, because it is supposed to have the effect of placing such verbs *relatively* in the same time. This, then, is what Dr. Robertson means when he says, '*Tempora definita*,' i.e. his preterite and future are such when uninterfered with by other considerations; '*Tempora vero relativa*,' i.e. when so interfered with. He adds, '*Imperfectum præteritum . . . videtur esse præsens quoddam relativum seu præsens in re præteriti.*' So much Mr. Weir prints in italics, implying, apparently, their entire justification of his view of this question. But should not Mr. Weir have shown, that Dr. Robertson's '*præsens quoddam relativum*' is the same thing as my *relative present tense*, if he intended to make his charge good? The fact, however, is, Dr. Robertson has no formal *present tense* at all! His '*quoddam præsens*,' therefore, could hardly have been the original of my *present tense*, or of its *relative* use.

But there is another consideration which Mr. Weir has omitted, and which I will supply: it is this. Dr. Robertson's governing principle requires not any change of position in the agent or nominative, which is just what my principle does, and which Mr. Weir has himself adopted; but the mere technical position of the verb with the supposition, that it is deprived of its *real* tense. Dr. Robertson's words are (Ed. 1758, p. 252) '*Ea Hebrææ linguæ indoles esse videtur, ut suo præterito cum waw immediatè præfixo utatur, ad significandum id planè tempus quod jam præcesserit; atque adeo hoc præteritum, cum waw præfixo, continuandæ orationi per eadem tempora inserviat: solent enim Hebræi, quando oratio aliquamdiu eisdem temporibus, sive Præteritis sive Futuris continuatur, postquam sermonem, sive Præterito aut Futuro tempore inchoaverunt, in decursu orationis . . . suum Præteritum ponere cum waw præfixo.*' Much to the same effect may be given from Koolhaas, and others. I will only add John Buxtorf's statement of this doctrine, which will suffice to show that it is much older than Mr. Weir has imagined (Thes. Gram., ed. 1651, p. 94): '*Præterito (enallage) pro futuro, et Futuro pro præterito, tum per e et simpliciter in prophetiis, tum propter præfixam literam et, ut antè dictum, et plenè traditur, lib. 2, cap. 21. In continuata etiam sententia, sequens Tempus trahitur plerunque in naturam præcedentis.*'

Now, whatever difference may be here discovered between these statements of Dr. Robertson and John Buxtorf, the *principle* adopted by both is certainly the same. Both teach nothing beyond certain results to be obtained from an artificial position of words, with the depriving of both the tenses of their powers; all which I will affirm are technicalities incapable of support.

What, in the next place, does my system propose? First, that the tenses

tenses are respectively and invariably the *past* and the *present*: nor is this assumed, but shown both from the obvious requirements of Hebrew contexts, and from the usage of all the Shemitic families, who still retain, *essentially*, the language of their forefathers. And, again, that these tenses are used either *absolutely*, as their several positions may require, or *relatively*, when the agent or nominative chooses to transport himself, as it were, into such other times as the nature of the context may have introduced; *i.e.*, supposing a narrative to have commenced in the *past tense*, intimating thereby that some event or events so mentioned are *past*; and, if a *present* tense follow such leading preterite, then the agent may be considered as having carried himself back into the time so introduced, and viewing—as present—the events so mentioned: in this case such *present* tense will be *relatively* present to the time so introduced, just as in the historical use of the same tense in our own language.

Now, whatever accidental coincidence may be discovered between this and the system of Koolhaas, nothing surely can be more certain than that the principles governing both are totally different: and, be it remembered, it is with *principle*, and with *principle only*, that I am now concerned. I will affirm, too, that it is this principle of changing the position of the agent as to time, that Mr. Weir pirated from my work, and that it was with this that I charged him, not with the artificial position of Koolhaas, &c., which also makes an *absolute* and *relative use of the tenses* on totally different grounds. It was this, too, by which Mr. Weir has declared more than once, that he could solve every difficulty in the tense-system of the Hebrews; and which he now labours to confound with a theory totally different! I will leave it now to Mr. Weir to determine, whether this is to be ascribed to a want of ingenuousness or of knowledge.

But Mr. Weir also attempts a defence of Drs. Ewald and Murphy's piracies from me on these same grounds. It is rather extraordinary, surely, that the former of these gentlemen should not have seen that the doctrine he had pirated from me—and with this I charged him—was, after all, that of Dr. Robertson, &c., and that I had stolen it from them! Ewald certainly knew better, and accordingly his Grammar has assumed a very different character from theirs, as shown in my examination of it.

Mr. Weir does me some injustice, moreover, when he says that I have affirmed this doctrine to be mine, and mine only; but Mr. Weir is not remarkably scrupulous in this respect,—the fact being, that I have ascribed it to the grammarians of the East, from some of whom I extracted the essence of all my rules grounded upon it. It is very true, indeed, it did occur to me, before I read it in their commentaries; but this alters not the fact as to its original proprietors. All I insist upon is, that it was from me that Mr. Weir, &c., took it, because I have strong reasons for believing that neither of them either could, or did, find it in these authors. As to Mr. Weir's withdrawing this his charge or not, it will be matter of no concern whatever to me, and it must be obvious enough to every one that I cannot withdraw mine.

Mr. Professor Weir having then so far defended himself (p. 486), he next proceeds to defend his theory. He tells us that, after examining

ing all that I have said, both in my Grammar and my examination of Ewald, it is quite clear to him that the question cannot be settled by an appeal to Arabic or Persian forms of speech. He adds, 'The forms of expression which Dr. Lee appeals to are by no means to the purpose.' I may ask the Professor of Oriental languages at Glasgow why? I have appealed to the Arabic, Syriac, Ethiopic, Amharic, and Persic use of the tenses, and have shown that the principle governing them all is identical with that which I have applied to the Hebrew: that the preterite is always a preterite, the present always a present, in one sense or other; and that the Hebraisms of the New Testament bear this out. And was not all this to the purpose? If not, why has he not given his proofs? His opinions, with their grounds, I know too well to place any reliance on them.

But he does give us some particulars. He asks, 'In what other languages do we find those regular changes from קטל to יקטל, and from יקטל to קטל, which we meet with in Hebrew?' I answer, we find them in every one of the languages just named. If this is not the fact, let Mr. Weir show it.

'In what other language do we meet with anything corresponding to the so-called *conversive*? And yet,' continues Mr. Weir, 'that is the central difficulty of the Hebrew syntax.' I answer, in every one of the above-named languages there does something corresponding to this so-called particle occur; while no one of their grammarians has ever given it this groundless name, or has supposed it to involve anything like the central difficulty here mentioned. Nor does it in the Hebrew syntax really present any such difficulty, the Arabian grammarians easily accounting for every shade of meaning that its connection with Hebrew syntax can require. That Mr. Weir does not know this, is very probable; but let it not hence be concluded that what he says is necessarily true.

Mr. Weir, however, proceeds more vigorously in his note here (p. 486), and tells us that the tenses of the Arabic are as much matters of discussion as those of the Hebrew, and, therefore, very unfit things to determine our question. He affirms, moreover, that I stand almost alone in supposing the contrary; and again, that, although I am no Papist, I seem as much attached to tradition as Romanists are to the Fathers. I do not think it necessary to offer anything in reply to this morsel of pleasantry; I will only say, Mr. Weir is as grossly mistaken in affirming that the Arabic tenses are as unsettled as the Hebrew ones, as he is when he asserts that my theory is that of Koolhaas, Dr. Robertson, &c.; and that when he shall have qualified himself to read the grammars of Arabia, Syria, &c., he will tell a very different tale; if he has done this already, he can, of course, adduce his proofs. About the differences of opinion between Erpenius and De Sacy, I am not concerned; they may be as far from the truth on this matter as Mr. Weir certainly is.

We now come to Mr. Weir's defence (p. 487), 'the leading principle which I endeavoured . . . to establish . . . was . . . that the Hebrew writers, instead of keeping constantly in view the period *at* which they wrote . . . accomplished' (their) 'object by keeping their own times quite

quite out of view, and regarding as their present the period, not *at* which, but *of* which they wrote.' I must remind Mr. Professor Weir, that this had been established long before he wrote or was born, by the grammarians of Arabia, as I have shown abundantly at length, but which the same Mr. Weir has nevertheless affirmed is not to the purpose! and yet he here declares it to be the one thing needful 'in unravelling the intricacies of the Hebrew tense-usages!' Is not this strange? Nor is it true that the Hebrews do so keep their own times *quite* out of view; no, not even on his own application of the said principle; for he tells us that both the form קָדַם , and all the participles, do bring their own times into view!

But Mr. Professor Weir far outstrips these his leaders—for whose opinions, however, he ought to thank me—when he says (*ib.*), 'In that language (*i. e.* the Hebrew) an action done and a present action seem to be one and the same thing; which involves a palpable impossibility in itself, and is untrue as to every language under the sun. *Doing* and *done* can, by no artifice, be made to mean the same thing; nor is any such thing ever implied in Hebrew. But why has Mr. Weir withholden his proofs? He now tells us, indeed, that 'the principle is not put forth as one deduced from the nature of things, or from the peculiar conformation of the Hebrew mind; but simply as an hypothesis, by means of which to explain some acknowledged difficulties of the Hebrew language.' This theory, therefore, so enounced, is, after all, a mere *nonentity*! but, what is worse, it is at cuffs with his (my?) previously enounced principle, which does not contemplate things *doing* as *done*, but, on the contrary, things *doing* as at some time *doing*, and things *done* as then done. If Mr. Weir means that things contemplated by the writer as *doing*, but which must by the reader, placed in other times, be considered as *done*, I shall not object; while I must, that this is not what *he* has said; as I also must that this confessedly groundless hypothesis presents something quite as useless as it is groundless.

Dismissing, then, elementary questions of this sort, Mr. Weir next conducts us to his former criticisms on the verb קָדַם , in Gen. i. 1, which he had adduced to show may be translated by *He creates*; and hence, that the form קָדַם exhibited really a *present* tense. His argument now is, not that he adduced this verb to *prove* that this was the case, but only to illustrate his meaning, viz., that it may be translated by a *present* as well as by a *past* tense. But why has illustration only been given, when good proof was the thing wanted? and what is to be gained, were the supposition to be admitted, that the present may be taken as well as the past? Mr. Weir's words are, 'Grant me that קָדַם may be a present tense here . . . then I undertake to solve all the difficulties connected with the tenses.' That is to say, only allow Mr. Weir to deprive the Hebrew grammar and Bible of one of the most certain things that they possess, and then he will have the opportunity afforded him of satisfying himself, at least, that he has made all as plain as anything to be found in 'the reading made more easy!' But is not this a little vainglorious, and intended to imply that Mr. Weir is a very giant in matters of this sort?

But

But some proofs are offered here; let us see what they amount to. 'The narrative begins,' says Mr. Weir, 'with the noun בְּרֵאשִׁית'—which, however, is something more than a noun! 'That term,' continues he, 'fixes the time of which the historian is speaking,' or rather is about to speak. It is added, 'It is in relation to the period thus fixed that הַיּוֹם is present. Does Dr. Lee,' asks Mr. Weir, 'object to this?' I answer, Dr. Lee does: first, because Mr. Weir's mode of stating the case assumes the point in debate; and secondly, that, should his notion be adopted, it would be ruinous.

As to the first case, the terms '*in the beginning*,' i. e. at some point of time long before that of the writer, fixes, according to Mr. Weir, the *tense* of הַיּוֹם as a *present*; that is, in other words, because the Hebrews occasionally place themselves within the times of their narratives, they necessarily always do! And, is an assertion only sufficient to prove this? The fact, however, is, it is the usual practice with them, when commencing narratives, to do otherwise, as the grammarians, Eastern and Western, have shown times innumerable, and as the genius of all the Shemitic languages clearly requires. And, as to the second case, if grammarians are thus to impose canons, in conformity with everything they may be able to make plausible; then, I say, farewell to everything like certainty in language; and, not only so, but to everything like good reasoning.

But Mr. Professor Weir has my own authority, as it should seem, for what he here contends. 'Dr. Lee,' says he, 'lays it down in his Grammar, that a writer, in commencing his narrative, "must (will?) necessarily speak of past, present, or future time, with reference to the period at which his statement is made."' Mr. Weir adds—'But the fact is, that many of the Scripture narratives begin with what Dr. Lee himself calls the present tense. . . His solution is—"I believe the writer has taken the liberty of transporting himself and his reader into former times without the usual notice, i. e. some term expressive of past time."' Mr. Weir now asks, 'Is it not extraordinary that Dr. Lee should object to הַיּוֹם being accounted a present tense, when it is actually accompanied by such a term—the term בְּרֵאשִׁית'? In the first place, I am inconsistent in my rules; in the second, I refuse to comply with them! But I cannot at present see any inconsistency in giving a general rule according to the necessity of the case, and then enouncing another *apparently* differing from it, but which really does not upon the supposition of an ellipsis. I gave, moreover, instances at the same time (Heb. Gram. p. 339) of similar usages, in which such ellipsis was supplied. So much for my inconsistency.

As to my nonconformity with my own rules, this, as before, is a mere hallucination of Mr. Weir; no rule of mine requiring, that in the beginning of narratives the *preterite* form must have a *present* signification; nor, that terms preceding verbs must necessarily determine their tenses; the fact being, as in the cases alluded to, that such qualifying terms *necessarily follow the verb.** And, once more, my

* That is, when a verb commences a discourse, &c. The places alluded to are these:—Gen. xxxviii. 1, וַיְהִי בַּעֲתָהּ הַזֶּה, *So it happens at that time*; ib. xxxix. 11, rule

rule applies to one case, Mr. Weir's reasoning to another! Mr. Weir's surprise may, therefore, be thus expressed: Dr. Lee cannot see that **נִרְאָה** is to be taken in the *present* tense, when it clearly refers to a *past* event, i. e. when it is accompanied by the term **נִרְאָה שֶׁכֵּן**, evidently given to determine this!

But Dr. Lee has taken **נִרְאָה** (ver. 3) here in the *present* tense; and why not the verb **נִרְאָה**? Because **נִרְאָה** has the form proper for the present tense; is not placed at the beginning of the narrative, but follows in the apocopated form necessary to mark its dependence on another; and because all is in strict accordance with the all-availing golden rule of Mr. Weir, alias Dr. Robertson, alias myself, &c., representing the agent as speaking in the present tense, and in time *present* to the events of his narrative.

Mr. Weir now declares—as, indeed, he well might after so able a defence of his theory—that my remarks have not induced him to abandon, or even to modify, the principle unfolded in his former paper. I must once more remind Mr. Weir, that the principle so unfolded had been previously unfolded by me, and had been borrowed by him from my Grammar; and, further, that it has nothing whatever to do with this his attempt to turn the *preterite*, **נִרְאָה**, of Gen. i. 1, into a *present* tense. But whether he choose to abandon this his figment or not, is matter of no moment whatever to me; and perhaps the same may be said by all.

But Professor Weir finds some comfort in the consideration that Dr. Murphy is *all but* with him (p. 489). I need only say to this, that, supposing Dr. Murphy to be right—which has not yet been proved—the ‘all but’ of Mr. Weir is quite sufficient to deprive him of Dr. Murphy's support. And, again, that, should Dr. Murphy have had no objection to accompany him to the very edge of a precipice, it will not hence follow that he ought also to have done so one step farther. This is quite another thing.

I am next admonished that I was nodding; good Mr. Weir then appeals from Dr. Lee asleep to Dr. Lee awake, and repeats his charges of inconsistency. I had said, ‘that to the present tense the participles and infinitives are nearly allied . . . either of them, when *unrestricted* by other considerations, is generally to be understood as referring to the *present time*’ . . . ‘the participles’ (again) ‘include within themselves no particular tense, and are to be construed . . . either in the past, present, or future, as the context may require,’ &c. My inconsistency here is found, I suppose, in terming the participles *concrete* nouns, and in saying that a concrete noun *might*, from its ‘necessarily involving an agent, have been taken to mark the preterite tense; and here, again, Mr. Weir has very ingeniously confounded himself by imagining, that the etymological character of words must necessarily and invariably regulate their *idiomatical* usage. In some cases it clearly does, as in the *preterite* and *present* tenses of verbs:

וַיְהִי כִּהְיוֹם הַזֶּה, *So it happens as on this day*. See also Job i. 5; to which it would be easy to add many others.

and,

and, although the concrete character of the participles has not been allowed to mark invariably a preterite tense, yet, let me tell Mr. Weir, it does nevertheless retain its powers as a concrete noun, and will not, as the present tense does, imply contingency, but certainty, reality, and occasionally permanency, as to the action or the character of the action implied by the verb.

This will enable us to unravel another very pretty piece of Mr. Weir's sophistry. The form *קָטַל* will signify, as an agent, *one killing*. 'That is,' says Mr. Weir . . . 'the act of killing necessarily implies an agent who kills: the agent must have been in existence prior to the act of killing; therefore the act of killing must have had a prior existence too.' That is to say, the act of killing must necessarily have taken place before it took place! Is it not a pity that this very able logician should have taken so much pains to dig a pit for another, of which he was so soon to become the tenant?

But Mr. Weir's conclusion is bad in another respect. He has had the misfortune to take my *hypothetical* expression, and to argue from it as from a positive affirmation. My words are, 'In the absence of any other determining consideration, this (*i. e.* form *קָטַל*) "*might be well taken*" as supplying to the verbal sense priority of action.' But is this the same thing as saying that it is, or must necessarily be, so taken?

Pleased with this syllogistic victory Mr. Weir now grows bold: he now affirms, quite à la Ewald,^b 'that the participle includes within it the idea of the present time, and that it is never employed to indicate any other time than present;' *i. e.*, I suppose, either *absolute* or *relative*. But here I shall show, that Mr. Weir is just as infelicitous as his prototype Ewald, and I will keep as nearly to his own places of citation as I can.

It will be remembered that he adduced certain places in Zechariah to show that, as certain so-called preterites were found in the parallels with participles, and that as these participles necessarily marked the present tense, so must these preterites likewise; and that, therefore, they could never truly mark the preterite, but must the present tense. It was in support of this notion that the above assertion was made.

Turn we now to Zech. vi. 6, and we shall find *הַפָּסָחִים יֹצְאִים*, *The horses . . . going forth*. Now, as the prophet is relating an event past—a vision which he had seen—the participle *יֹצְאִים* cannot be in the *absolute* present tense: this is certain: it implies, therefore, of necessity, a *past tense*; but may, *relatively* only, be a *present*.

If, however, we go on to ver. 8, we shall find this same participle implying a time still farther removed from the *absolute* present, and, therefore, a pluperfect tense in that acceptation, and a *past tense* in every case, *e. g.* *רָאָה הַיּוֹצְאִים הַנִּיחָו*, *See, the goers forth . . . have quieted*, &c. But these horses must have gone forth before they could have produced this effect; and they are here represented as *having*

^b See p. 61 of my Examination of the grammatical principles of this great man.
done

done it. The tense of נִסְּיוֹן is here, therefore, *preterite* to the *relative* present time of the narrative; and, consequently, Mr. Weir's very bold assertion is untrue! See also ch. vii. 7; viii. 10, &c.

But Mr. Weir's assertion is faulty in another respect. These participles do occasionally imply the future tense, *e. g. ib.* ch. viii. 7, הֵנִי מֵשִׁיב , which must, from the context, necessarily imply *future time*. See also ch. vi. 13; viii. 5, 9—to which innumerable other places may be added. That participles are thus used no grammarian has, I believe, ever doubted; and it is probable that no reasonable one ever will: Mr. Weir's bold assertion is, therefore, quite à la Ewald, as groundless as it is daring!

But Mr. Weir did not adduce these participles to prove that the form קָרַב marked the present tense; he did this merely to illustrate his meaning (p. 491). His main proof, he now tells us, rests on the fact, 'that, by assigning to it this signification, the most formidable difficulties of the Hebrew syntax might be removed.' Mr. Weir will excuse me, I trust, when I affirm, that this removal of difficulties from the Hebrew syntax has not yet been proved to be a *fact*: no, nor has anything like proof to this effect been offered: illustrations only of Mr. Weir's meaning have been: this fact I acknowledge. Nor do I gain anything more by turning back to p. 200 of your July Number; or to p. 215 of your eighth Number. It is nevertheless *true*, that Mr. Weir did not adduce these participles to *prove* the point in question; it was only to *get* his notion on it believed. I am very willing to allow Mr. Weir to escape through this mesh.

Still, I am told, there is something in the first clause of Zech. vi. 6, to which I have not sufficiently attended; and this it should seem lies in the participle נִסְּיוֹן . Well; and what does it imply? Surely that the horses meant *had been seen going forth* in the vision. That is, this participle presents no independent *present* tense, but is restricted to the *preterite* by the circumstances of the vision: and to this, as noticed in my last, the two preterites נִסְּיוֹן give their cordial and combined testimony. We may now, therefore, take our leave of Mr. Weir's reasonings on the form קָרַב , put for a present tense; assuring him, that when he shall have made out the fact—which I will venture to predict will not be very soon—that his theory will remove the difficulties, &c., of the syntax, we shall be among the first to embrace it, and to thank him for it; but not till that is done.

Come we now to Professor Weir's further reasoning about the time intended by the form קָרַב . This he makes the *future*; while I affirm that it is the *present*. But here Mr. Weir has almost all the Hebrew grammarians with him; and even Ewald, who makes it an imperfect *past tense*, is so far with him, that, in terming it an *imperfect*, he necessarily implies something yet to be done; *i. e.*, if I say that *John was beating Thomas*, the meaning is, that as John did not then finish beating him; Thomas has still to expect what may be termed the *finishing stroke* of this! Mr. Weir then coolly concludes, 'My views being, therefore'—particularly in this last case—'in substantial accordance with the views of all Hebrew grammarians. . . I need not enter

enter into a lengthened defence of them;’ i. e. because that which every-body says, must be true! and especially if they tell us, that the imperfect past really has a *future* signification!

But Mr. Weir does enter into the defence of them; and his first endeavour is to make me talk inconsistently, in reminding me that he had made the imperative the ground-form of his future, but had afterwards recurred to the infinitive for this. The inconsistency which Mr. Weir so cleverly lays upon me, he affects not to understand; as if it were impossible he could be inconsistent at all. Still, this is the fact, and in the very next paragraph Mr. Weir acknowledges it!

The argument now offered however is, not, that this form seems to be derived from the imperative, but that the Hebrew writers seem to include the idea of futurity in it. No doubt, I answer; but then they also do include that of the present. We are next told, as just now noticed, that the form *יָפַד* is, as he had said, ‘just the infinitive with the pronominal affixes;’ but then, that the imperative is much the same thing, because even the infinitives have a future signification: and this, again he tells us, he endeavoured to trace through a variety of Hebrew idioms (pp. 319-324).

The proof offered, that the infinitives have a future signification, is simply this. The infinitive form is occasionally used as an imperative; but the imperative implies futurity—which is a subtlety unknown to practical grammar, as I had already said;—and, therefore, the infinitive must imply futurity also. That is, if an abstract noun is by mere idiomatical usage applied as an imperative occasionally, that said abstract noun, as well as the verb formed upon it, must have a future signification also! It would be cruel to offer any remark on this reasoning, certainly.

But, further, Mr. Weir has endeavoured to trace this future signification through a variety of Hebrew idioms. And I have endeavoured to follow him; and the result of my endeavours has been, that he has proved nothing of the kind. One of Mr. Weir’s favourite arguments in these his endeavours has been, that as this form, following a preterite *absolutely* considered, will take an absolute preterite signification, still it will have a future one *relatively*, and as considered with reference to such preceding verb; and, therefore, the Hebrew writers include within it a future signification. This, as I have already remarked, is a deceptive subtlety: it is, in fact, a groundless Jewish figment, as stated in my former letter; it is, moreover, the lame expedient of Koolhaas noticed above, which he deemed necessary to adopt in order to give a colour of plausibility to his system. I must affirm, therefore, that the futurity claimed for the form *יָפַד*, by virtue of this, is visionary and false; and that the results of Mr. Weir’s endeavours, made through the variety of idioms of which he talks, are not entitled to a moment’s confidence.

But let us see what arguments Mr. Weir can produce as to the usage of this form. I objected to his solution of *יָפַד*, ‘*I to be born*,’ because I could not see how *יָפַד* could possibly have a future signification under any view of the tenses, *absolute* or *relative*. If it was to
be

be understood as enouncing a prophecy by Job before he was born; then, I said, it was a new thing in the earth, and presented a problem too hard for me to solve. This, Mr. Weir affirms, was laughing at him, and for it he affects to call me to serious account, of which presently.

As to the particle 'to' in '*I to be born*,' he now declares he never meant to argue that any futurity was contained in it, but only by it to give expression to the place in the best way he could. He must mean, *in the worst way he could*: for surely a worse rendering of the place in question can scarcely be conceived. He further tells us, that a future sense had already been elicited. But where? I can find no such thing done; and, I think, no one else can. I cannot, therefore, allow Mr. Weir to escape in this way, but am compelled still to hold that the futurity claimed for this verb was intended to receive its main support from the particle 'to.' But Mr. Weir objects to my having recourse to this example, because the usage is, as he says, rare. Not quite so rare, perhaps, as Mr. Weir would have it believed. I will supply him with a few instances: he may at his leisure collect hundreds of others—*e. g.*, Job iii. 3, אָמַר, the place in question; ib. 11, אָמַר, אָמַר; 12, אָמַר; 13, אָמַר, אָמַר; 16, אָמַר, which is rather a large number of great rarities occurring within one chapter only! See also Ps. cxvii.

But the truth is, this usage abounds in the Hebrew Bible: every case in which we have a present tense, used in a preterite signification, is, in fact, an example of it—not under Mr. Weir's theory I grant; but his theory is false. Nor is this less true because a *conversive vav* (1) does not accompany it; for that particle has nothing whatever to do in regulating the tenses, as I have shown in my examination of Ewald (p. 76, &c.). It has much to do as a conjunction, and, at the same time, in implying a *sequence*—*e. g.*, Gen. i. 3, וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים, *So, or accordingly, &c., God says, i. e.* upon that occasion; and for this purpose the verb is apocopated, and the accent drawn back. This Dr. Ewald considered a secret worth knowing, and he purloined it accordingly from my Grammar. In all such cases the figment of Koolhaas, &c., is unnecessary, and so is the notion about a *conversive vav*. The reader has but to place himself in imagination in the time of the event, and we have a very natural instance of the historic tense of Europeans. This, as I have elsewhere shown, is what the Eastern grammarians have ever taught; they have, therefore, felt no necessity

⁴ I offered in my last (p. 203) a parallel to this usage in the Greek of St. John, viii. 58, in which our Lord—and no one else could do this—spoke of his existence prior to his birth; and here the Greek present εἰμι, not εἶρα, is employed. But a Hebrew usage of this sort is to be found in Prov. viii. 25, 26, 30, thus: וְאָמַרְתָּ בְּרִיךְ הוּא אֱלֹהִים, where the verb is repeated; and this is, as I hold, said in the person of our Lord likewise. And here the verb אָמַר must necessarily be in the *present* tense, because we have no possible point of earlier antiquity to which we can recur. The same is the case in John viii. 58; and the present tense is, therefore, necessarily used.

Mr. Weir now drops the argument as to the *simple* use of the tenses, and originates a new question on their use in a combined series, and because this is the thing to be considered. We are now, therefore, to determine in a complex usage, that which a simple one could not settle for us. I may suggest to Mr. Weir here,—what he will find to be the fact,—that he will gain nothing whatever by this shift. It was well enough, perhaps, for the moment to turn the attention of the reader from the troublesome case of וַיִּקְרָא , &c., to others in no respect less so, but which would be a relief for a moment. I need not repeat my explanations given in your Number for July last. I will only affirm, in reply to Mr. Weir's affirmations, that, as far as they went they were to the purpose, and that it is out of his power to show the contrary.

First, then, as to Mr. Weir's first formula, which is that of Gen. i. 5, given above. We have here for the leading term וַיִּקְרָא , and the question now is, Is this necessarily a future tense? If it is, then may it be translated, *and God shall call the light day*. But the narration here is clearly that of a *past* event; and, as the *conversivum* is prefixed, the authority of which Mr. Weir has acknowledged above, the tense must be *the past* on this account also. But Mr. Weir has a subtlety which will override all this: viz., the event so past, *absolutely* considered, is still future relatively with respect to some preceding verb. I must remind Mr. Weir that this is to adopt the exploded theory of Koolhaas, Dr. Robertson, &c., which labours under the gross absurdity of having recourse to a refinement too puerile to be expressed in translation, and therefore of no use beyond that of keeping in countenance certain visionary speculators on the grammar of the Hebrews! The combination so propounded has, therefore, only had the effect of bringing us back to the difficulties we had to contend with without it.

But there are other objections to Mr. Weir's new mode of putting his question. One of them is this: His formula takes it for granted, that its leading word is in an *independent* condition; and further, that it influences in its own right the following וַיִּקְרָא ; but both these things are false. For, first, even on his own showing, וַיִּקְרָא must take its futurity from some preceding verb. It is not therefore independent; and if so, it can have no place in a formula propounded for the purpose of determining a law for the government of the tenses. Nor, for other reasons already given, can it exercise any influence upon וַיִּקְרָא , the verb following. And once more, this וַיִּקְרָא , together with other verbs in the same relation here, as וַיִּבְרָא , וַיִּהְיֶה , וַיִּאמַר , &c., is in the state of apocopation, as far as it can be, and this for the purpose also of marking its dependence on the preceding context, and its *sequence* to it. The formula itself is, therefore, false and deceptive, and any consequence deduced under its authority must be bad.

But Mr. Weir also desires to know why the form $\text{וַיִּקְרָא} \dots \text{וַיִּקְרָא}$ never occurs. I ask in my turn, Is a grammarian bound to account for the non-occurrence of any, or every, possible case that may be imagined? I think not. But I will relieve Mr. Weir from troubling himself to answer this, because his proposed unknown case does occur; we have it thus, in Gen. i. 15, $\text{וַיִּבְרָא} \dots \text{וַיִּהְיֶה} \dots \text{וַיִּקְרָא} \dots \text{וַיִּקְרָא}$! To

this innumerable, other instances might be added were it necessary; any one, moderately versed in the Hebrew, can look them out for himself, and even Professor Weir may find the inquiry valuable.⁴

We have now only to examine, as briefly as we can, Mr. Weir's solutions of his own formulæ in illustration of his own theory. I must, however, notice one objection to my former statements, and which has nothing to recommend it beyond an assertion. It is this. 'To say that the Hebrew writers recur to their own times, just as the Greek and Latin historians do, is certainly a most extraordinary statement.' I ask, why so? Is it not the fact, that different languages do occasionally proceed on the same rules, and exhibit the very same usages? If this is extraordinary to Mr. Weir, he is perhaps the only writer on grammar in the universe of whom this can be said. But it is only a silly assertion, and scarcely worthy of notice.

But I have given no explanation. I answer, my explanation given was—and which is quite sufficient for this usage—that the writer had at his pleasure resumed his original position, and written accordingly: just as one may say in English—*John went yesterday to London, there he sees Thomas; then he set out for Oxford.* Mr. Weir's ground of objection is (p. 495), because 'in almost every case we are able to perceive and assign the reason of the change.' Which must mean, I sup-

⁴ As nothing on such questions as this can be made out in the technical manner adopted by Messrs. Ewald, Weir, &c., I have thought it right to give here the following brief outline, which may profitably be filled up to any required extent. The sense to be given (i. e. logically) is the first thing to be considered by one about to write Hebrew; the distribution of the terms to be used (rhetorically) the second; and, lastly, the usages of the language (grammatically). The sense may be *narrative, imperative, instructive*, or otherwise. As to the order, *that* which is most important will come first: qualifying terms will therefore always follow. The use of the tenses is grammatical, and must be taken as it is found in common parlance, &c. Another consideration is, as the different members of a period must have some relation to one another as to sense, so also must they as to forms, otherwise this relation could not be known. E. g. of narrative: Job i. 1, שָׁמַע אֱלֹהִים is the important term here; it stands first therefore: הָיָה at once qualifies it, and determines the fact that the event is past. In the next member הָיָה is the important term; שָׁמַע determines its agent. Verse 2, וַיִּבְרָךְ is its important term: its *present* tense places the reader in the times of Job; and its accent is retracted (apocopation being impossible in this form), to show that it is dependent on the verse preceding. Verse 3, וַיִּהְיֶה is in the same relation in both places. Verse 4, וַיִּהְיֶה is in the relation of apposition with the verse 1: it is therefore in the *tense* and *time* of that verse, and so are the other preterites here. Verse 5, וַיִּהְיֶה assumes relation with וַיִּבְרָךְ &c. preceding, and may be considered as in apposition with them, as in the same time, and apocopated in order to show this. *Id.*, וַיִּבְרָךְ necessarily introduces a new sentence in both cases here; and the writer has chosen to place these in the original time of the narrative, which is most natural: the same is the case with וַיִּהְיֶה, and with the other preterites; and the presents, as before, are made dependent on, and present to, these. In the same way may any series of members be readily analysed, taking care to observe the nature of interrogations, quotations, commands, parentheses, hypothetical constructions, ellipses, &c., together with the abrupt changes of persons, the influence of figures, and the like, and no great difficulty will be found.

pose, we are able to see and assign a reason different from that given by Dr. Lee. So far we have only Mr. Weir's opinion.

Now for his solution, which he tells us is 'an easy and natural one.' 'The reader,' says Mr. Weir, 'takes his stand in thought at the event he records. The event he regards not only as *done*, but as *done* before his eyes:' and as Ewald's meaning is claimed here, it must also be *finished* before his eyes: in other words, he views it both as *doing* and as *done*; which, according to Mr. Weir, as seen above, is just the same thing. This appears to be intended to suit the verb בָּרָא in Gen. i. 1. This verb signifies, therefore, both the action of creating, *i.e.*, as going on, and also as *finished*: and if so, the writer must have placed himself under the marvellous influence of the verb בָּרָא in times, both before a man was in existence, and again when the action of בָּרָא was *finished*: and this Mr. Weir terms a *simple* and *easy* solution of this very simple place!

But let us try this process on Job iii. 2, &c. Job now,—supposing him to have been the writer,—takes his stand at the event he records, and views it as *doing* and as *done*. 'From this position he looks forward on the events that follow, and he employs the future tense.' We have Job here, therefore, placed at the event he records; and then, looking on to the future, he employs the future tense אֶמְלֹךְ, &c. But I want to know where I am to find the thing then *doing*, and *done*, even before the eyes of the writer, and which it must, according to Mr. Professor Weir's theory, have been his object to record. I can find no such thing here; I can only find his future tense recording the only event mentioned. It must be the time of this event, therefore, from which the futurity of the verb אֶמְלֹךְ must be reckoned; and this will quadrate well enough with Mr. Weir's '*I to be born*,' already noticed. And what must now be our conclusion? Why, I suppose, that Job looked onward into *futurity* to a second birth, à la Nicodemus; for certainly an earthly birth is the thing had in view. And so our solution is '*natural, simple, and easy*.'

Once more, and I have done. 'Should some other prominent object . . . be brought before the mind of the writer, so as to be viewed . . . as a present object, in that case the object is set down in the beginning of the clause . . . with the initial ו, and . . . the future necessarily gives place to the present.' This then is, of course, one of those instances in which פָּקַד, taken as a *present* tense, removes all the difficulty resting on the change of the tense-form. The rule is, no doubt, intended to meet the case of אֶקְרָא . . . ו, in Gen. i. 5. If so, I may perhaps ask Mr. Weir, Why have we not, in ver. 3 here, וְאֵחָד הָיָה, or וְהָיָה אֶחָד, instead of וְהָיָה אֶחָד? For surely the creation of *the light* must have been an object quite as prominent in the estimation of the writer, as that of *darkness* would. The writer was, I say, brought to view this very prominent object; and Why has not the future tense given place to the present? Because, of necessity, this writer had not been privileged with a sight of Mr. Weir's erudite papers on the doctrine of the tenses. I do not see what other satisfactory answer can be given to this question. I may take the liberty, perhaps, of suggesting

to Mr. Weir, that this sort of abstract dealing with this question, and similar ones, à la Ewald, of whose ways he is evidently an admirer and copyist, will avail him but little, except only with those who know nothing, or next to nothing, on these matters. Just as it was the case in the late attack of his Coryphæus made upon me, *he has proved nothing*. He has said much, indeed, and in doing this he has put forth considerable acuteness, but not always in the best taste: witness the miserable sophistry so often advanced for the purpose of making his opponent talk like a fool. I will only add, when Mr. Professor Weir shall have lectured on the Hebrew Bible in the University for about thirty years, shall have extended his range of inquiry much farther than he hitherto has done, and shall have deemed it prudent to trust more to things as they are than to syllogisms, or the airy nothings of such men as Ewald, he will, I venture to predict, be less vain-glorious, rash, and unceremonious. With this I bid him heartily farewell; assuring him, that I shall deem it quite unnecessary to notice any further remarks of his on Hebrew grammar, unless they deserve it much better than those noticed above.—I am, Sir, yours very faithfully,

SAMUEL LEE.

P.S. Perhaps you will allow me to say here, that, soon after this appears, I shall have published a few strictures on a notice given of my work on Prophecy in your last, p. 108 *seq.*

Barley, January 7, 1851.

SIR,—As Dr. Murphy has offered a defence of his tense system in your last, and particularly with reference to the objections I had made to it; and as his statements here are important to the decision of our question, it being my intention to offer nothing beyond this upon it, I trust you will favour me with its insertion in your next.

In the first place, Dr. Murphy offers a fallacy in answer to my objection (p. 217, No. Jan.). The question is not, as to what my notions about the participles in the Hebrew are, but what his rules require that they should be. His scheme makes what is usually termed the present active participle, his *central*, i. e. present *tense*. I had asked, And why not the *passive* participle also? His answer is, *הַמְּכַלֵּם* means *slain*, not *a-slaying*; and that he believes the anterior (i. e. *past tense*) to be the normal tense of the passive participle. But this is a groundless assumption, as a very little inquiry will show; for the fact is, this participle just as the active, and as shown above, is liable to every variety of tense. But, at any rate, the statement now made demolishes a very important part of Dr. Murphy's tense-tables.

To his translation of Gen. ii. 20, viz., '*And to Adam he has not found*,' I objected that it gave no sense whatsoever. The answer is, 'It is more literal,' i. e. than mine, '*And as to Adam, he found not*.' I then remarked that the Hebrew construction involved a nominative absolute. To this no objection is made, because perhaps none could be found. And if this be the case, Dr. Murphy's translation is not *only* not literal, but it is false and wrong. But if it be allowed to be literal,

literal, then must it follow that the original is, like the translation, senseless!

Dr. Murphy's next article is curious. He tells me that as both my tenses, *i. e.* the past and present, are occasionally found in all the tenses, they are not to be distinguished by past and present. He, however, chooses to call them the ~~anterior~~ anterior and posterior, *i. e.* the *past* and *future*; for, disguise the thing as you will, still anterior and posterior must be *past* and *future* with reference to some time; and these, upon his own showing, are likewise found in all the tenses! I do not see, therefore, as I formerly said, what is gained by this introduction of a new nomenclature, things remaining *in statu quo*.

In the next place, Dr. Murphy tells us that, although there is a relative use of the tenses—for this his own theory compels him to have recourse to—still there are no relative tenses (par. 3). He likewise states (par. 2) that '*each time-form has one only primary and proper meaning.*' He proceeds (par. 3), 'Now while there is obviously . . . an absolute and relative division of the tenses, there is no absolute and relative use of any tense.' Surely I may ask, How it is possible to conceive of a necessary *relative division of tenses*, while there is no *relative use of them*? But Dr. Murphy will relieve us of this difficulty. He tells us below (par. 5) that 'we are agreed as to the fact of the distinction of time in the Hebrew verb' being 'relative, and nothing but relative.' There is therefore, of necessity, a relative use of the tenses; and if there is a relative use of these, there must be an absolute one in some sense; for to talk about relation, without supposing something to which the relation is made, is absurd. But all this is obviously mere *logomachy*; for I hold that *each time-form has one only primary and proper meaning*; that my past tense is *always past* in some sense, my present *always present*, and that the relative uses of these are governed by some absolute consideration or other.

He tells us also, that this merely relative use of the tenses is what has been held by Ewald, Dr. Robertson, and others, as noticed by Professor Weir; and that, if I mean by past and present what he does by anterior and posterior, we are agreed. I need only say, that by *past* and *present* I mean, in the first case, the time *absolutely* so with regard to any speaker or writer. But, if I understand Dr. Murphy, he denies this; and consequently we are *not agreed*: and in this respect I differ necessarily from all the authorities here named by him. But here he is incorrect; for Ewald holds not only that by the preterite form פקד, action absolutely past is meant, but also finished action, which I have shown is groundless; and surely this must mean something more than relative.

Nor, again, has any one of the authors named by Dr. Murphy taught that the tenses of the Hebrew verb are relative only; nor has any other, so far as my knowledge goes. The doctrine of Koolhaas, Robertson, &c., as to *relative* and *absolute* here, I have given above, and have shown that it differs altogether from that adopted by me from the grammarians of Arabia. This I have also shown was pillaged from me by Ewald; and I affirm here again, that the same thing has been done both by Professor Weir and Dr. Murphy. Dr. Murphy indeed expresses

expresses his obligations to Mr. Weir a little lower down (par. 6), for having rescued him from the charge. He must now be aware, from what I have said in my letter above, that his friend has very egregiously failed, and that it still remains for him to do this for himself.

I am next blamed for not having called the tenses by names which would convey a correct impression as to their nature, as other grammarians have done. My answer is, I have called that tense which always implies time *past*, the *past tense*; that which implies time *present*, the *present tense*; and that other grammarians have, unless I am greatly mistaken, done the same thing. If I have not adopted Dr. Murphy's terms, it is because I have seen no necessity for doing so.

I have but one remark more to make; it is on Dr. Murphy's reasoning about the adoption of a concrete noun for the basis of my preterite, and of an abstract one for that of my present, tense. It is this:—'If a concrete noun naturally implies a connection actually formed with existence... an abstract noun naturally implies a want of connection with existing things... and is therefore fit to become the basis of, not the central, which has connection' (i. e. in Dr. Murphy's participles), 'but with the posterior, which has not yet such connection... This,' adds he, 'makes more for me than it does for himself.' But Dr. Murphy's central tense formed by participles is a *nonentity*, as abundantly shown above, and in my examination of Ewald. So far, this is disposed of. I ask, as to the other point, Will such non-connection naturally imply *futurity*, i. e. *posteriority* to something else preceding? For if it will not imply this, it will imply nothing to Dr. Murphy's purpose. My argument was this: Action, taking place at all, necessarily implies time *present* to this. How Dr. Murphy can show, that action unconnected with person must necessarily imply *futurity*, I am at a loss to imagine: in other words, how action, merely as such, taking place at any time, must necessarily take place at a time future, i. e. posterior, to itself. But can Dr. Murphy, or his friend Mr. Weir, show that a simple formal future exists in any language? My impression is, that no such thing does exist, or can exist. And if this be true, nothing perhaps further need be urged on the Jewish עתיד, or future of the Hebrew verb; and—

My conclusion is, that Dr. Murphy has succeeded neither in establishing his own theory, nor in destroying mine. I regret that I have been compelled to notice a slight disposition to wrangle in both my opponents. I will only add, I now wish them heartily farewell, assuring them that when they, or any other person, shall fairly have shown that I have erred, I shall lose no time in offering my recantation, with my cordial thanks for the favour.

SAMUEL LEE.

* * * As the different writers on this question seem to have sufficiently exhibited their sentiments, we think it well that the discussion should close here.—EDITOR.

ON THE INTERPRETATION OF ROM. ix. 3.

SIR,—In an article in No. VII. of your Journal, on Romans ix. 3, the writer invites attention to his proposed interpretation, and calls on others to support or gainsay it. I think that he has well stated that the whole difficulty lies in the force and meaning of ἀπό. I would retain the rendering of ἀπό as denoting, sometimes, the 'efficient cause,' but in that case would give the interpretation such a turn as would obviate the objection of there being 'something harsh in the idea of Christ as the *direct* author of the sufferings of his servants.'

On referring to Liddell and Scott's last edition of Passow's Lexicon, I find, under the article ἀπό, sec. iii. subsec. 3, that ἀπό sometimes means 'the cause or occasion,' and is rendered 'on account of, by reason of,'—and a line (1302) from the *Agamemnon* of Æschylus is quoted: τλήμων ἀπ' ἐντολῶν φρενός—'wretched by reason of his nobly daring soul.'

In almost all the attempts at interpretation by Waterland, Bandinel, and others, ἀπό seems considered as standing merely in connection with the words following it, and not as hanging on the verb *ἠνέχθη* in any way; and if this be granted, the meaning I claim for ἀπό, 'by reason of,' may as readily be conceded as Dr. Waterland's 'after the example,' or 'separation from,' as suggested by the Rev. Mr. Gordon.

Retaining then, for the present, the common version, except the word 'from,' the text will stand thus: 'For I could wish that myself were accursed *by reason of Christ*, for my brethren,' &c. Here Christ appears, not as the *direct* but the *passive* cause of St. Paul's being 'accursed.' There is no 'separation' from Christ. His relation to Christ still subsists, though he be 'accursed.' If it were not that he professed Christ, St. Paul would say, it could hardly be that he would be 'anathema,' but, professing Christ, he runs a risk of being 'anathema,' and therefore wills that, if possible, he should be *utterly* 'anathema,' Why? 'for his brethren,' &c.

But what does 'anathema' here mean? Liddell and Scott render ἀνάθεμα = ἀνάθημα—'a votive offering.' Turning then to the article 'Donaria' in Dr. Smith's *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities*, I find this passage: 'At Athens every one of the six thesmothetæ, or, according to Plato, all the nine archons, had to take an oath that if they violated any of the laws, they would dedicate in the temple of Delphi a *gilt statue of the size of the man* who dedicated it. In this case the anathema was a kind of punishment in which the statue was regarded as a *substitute* for the person forfeited to the gods.'

Now St. Paul, being well versed in Greek customs, as well as literature, may in this passage (Romans ix. 3) desire to offer himself as a living anathema for his brethren. They had rejected Christ, and thereby forfeited their souls and bodies; but St. Paul, such is his love, desires to be their 'anathema'—to stand before Christ, and take their guilt upon him. But how was this to be effected? St. Paul already 'died daily' 'by reason of Christ.' His very brethren heap tribulation, anguish, and persecution upon him. He will not check those tribulations, but turn them to the benefit of those inflicting them. Let them

them go to any lengths of persecution 'by reason of Christ.' Let him even be 'anathema' to his brethren—'a thing devoted'—an abomination—he glories in it, as he sees his plan of being 'anathema' for his brethren steadily advancing.

Thus *ἀνάθεμα* in this passage will have a double reference; the one to the last depth of 'accursedness,' the other to the function of the anathema—the substitution of the thing 'accursed' for the person whose guilt has required it.

I would also render *ἤτοίμην* not as 'I did wish' or 'I could wish,' but 'I keep wishing.' As I 'die daily,' so a continual 'yearning' towards my brethren seizes me—a continual longing—to stand between them and the 'wrath to come.'

Could St. Paul, writing to the Romans, wish to show by a lively example, the nature of the 'love of Christ' and of the atonement? Did he wish to point out that if he could wish to convert his very sufferings into a balm for his brethren—'sufferings, yea even to cursing'—what the nature of that Passion was, so meekly endured unto the end by Christ, for his brethren, 'the whole body of believers?' Is this passage a practical illustration of the power of 'love for the brethren'?

Should this interpretation be at all admissible, it at once removes all harshness from the idea of St. Paul's being 'anathema.' Far from desiring to be 'accursed from Christ,' the more he clings to him, the more he feels he is like to be anathema in the one sense—'accursed'—but like His Master he would fain be 'anathema' in the other sense—a substitute—a scapegoat.

But St. Paul's *faith* represses this ardent wish. He feels the impossibility of his earnest desire, and thus, I imagine, only hints at it by way of forcible and present illustration and example.

ΚΕΡΑΙΑ.

THE PROPER SUBJECTS OF FAITH AND PRAYER.

MR. EDITOR,—The correspondent who has written the suggestive remarks on 'the proper subjects of faith and prayer,' in the eighth number of your Journal, has opened the way for a discussion of some most important points. That discussion will prove a blessing to the churches of Christ if it should be the means of leading to more clear, definite, and settled ideas than at present prevail on those subjects.

The statement given by your correspondent, under two heads, of the different views entertained by Christians in relation to prayer, appears to me not to present the facts of the case in the most correct manner. The first part, designed to represent the popular view of the subject, states an extreme view of the subject, which does not prevail among the 'well taught' members of the churches, who adopt in the main the ideas intended by the representation. It is not held, we believe, by such, 'that we have warranty from Scripture to offer prayer and to exercise faith with reference to temporal calamities, etc., just as

as in affairs purely spiritual—‘That God will, in reply to the prayer of a believer, relieve our bodily afflictions, prevent starvation in extreme poverty, and otherwise honour faith as of old, in taking the superintendence of our temporal and physical concerns, *as the direct result of that faith.*’ This statement may describe the views of some who are not accustomed to much reflection, or who are not favoured with many advantages to guide them in their knowledge of revealed truth. But the representation does not strictly apply to those who are intelligently opposed to the views described in the second part. They would regard the first as presenting an extreme on the one hand, while the second they consider as an extreme on the other; they would look upon the first as having a tinge of enthusiasm, as they would view the other as having a tinge of scepticism. There is a medium between the two, in which we consider the majority of the well instructed Christians of the present day will be found; which appears to them to be most in accordance with the dictates of sound reason, the principles of the Divine government, and the revealed will of God. They consider that they are not authorized to offer prayer and to expect answers to prayer in relation to temporal things just as in affairs purely spiritual, but at the same time that they are not unauthorized to offer prayer for temporal mercies, or to believe in any degree that they will be given as direct answers to prayer. The Scripture doctrine on this subject we think might be briefly presented in two propositions, viz., that prayer, as an exercise of devotion acceptable to God, must chiefly relate to spiritual blessings, which are expressly promised to be bestowed on the sincere suppliant, which he is therefore authorized to believe that he shall receive in answer to his prayers—that in reference to temporal benefits, they are to be sought in prayer as subordinate to the higher blessings and the higher designs of Divine mercy; and that in this way there is reason to believe that, when accordant with the Divine will, they shall be given in answer to prayer.

The first of these propositions will be generally admitted by believers in Divine revelation. *There* we are most clearly taught that God is the hearer of prayer; that true prayer is the sincere rising of the heart to God, for blessings which shall be for our highest good and for his glory; that it is his gracious appointment that blessings, which are essential to our highest welfare, as accountable, immortal, but fallen beings, shall be imparted in answer to prayer; such blessings as the pardon of sin, a sanctifying influence, the favour of God, wisdom to guide us in the way to life, strength to sustain in the path of duty and to preserve from fatal danger, meetness for the heavenly inheritance. Under every dispensation God has been saying to man ‘Seek ye my face.’ The blessings of his special favour he has ever granted to humble suppliants. If we look at the devotional exercises of the ancient church as contained in the book of Psalms, we find that prayer chiefly related to the highest blessings, and that faith in prayer prevailed in reference to them. On these points the language of the inspired oracles is, ‘Ask, and ye shall receive; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened.’ ‘If ye, being evil, know how to give good gifts

gifts unto your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give the holy Spirit to them that ask him?' 'If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, who giveth to all liberally, and upbraideth not, and it shall be given him.' 'Let us come boldly to the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need.' If we go to plead with God for these blessings, we know that our desires are agreeable to his will; that we are seeking that which will certainly promote our highest good and the Divine glory; and that we are fully authorized by express promises to believe that such blessings will be bestowed in answer to our prayers. When we plead for blessings of this nature on behalf of *others*, we are encouraged to hope that they may be imparted, as they are certain blessings, which it is agreeable to the Divine mind to communicate; though, at the same time, there may be something in the state of those for whom we plead that may prevent a Being of infinite wisdom from bestowing upon them what we have desired.

But the chief point on which a difference of opinion prevails, and which is attended with some degree of difficulty, is the influence of prayer and the exercise of faith in reference to temporal concerns. It will be fully admitted, we suppose, that all human affairs come under the Divine superintendence, and that this superintendence will be exercised so as to promote the highest designs of God in relation to the happiness of man and his own glory. It may be clearly seen that these highest designs may be advanced by the mercies and afflictions of the present life. It is truly important that our dependence on God in these things should be realized and expressed. One of the most suitable means by which our sense of dependence on God in these things may be manifested and promoted, is by supplication for the bestowment of providential favours, and for deliverance from temporal calamities. Nor can we see why it should not be perfectly consistent with all the principles of the Divine government that God should hear and answer prayer for the bestowment of such blessings.

But the principal inquiry should be—'Do the Scriptures authorize this? if so, to what extent, and with what limitations?—and what is the province of faith in prayer when directed to these things?'

The main difficulty in replying to such inquiries appears to us to arise from the alleged difference between the present dispensation and all that have preceded it. It is said that the present dispensation is purely spiritual—'that the exclusive domain of faith is the spiritual world; the only right subjects of prayer are those relating to the spiritual interests of the race.' If we refer to Old Testament exhortations and promises, such as—'Call upon me in the day of trouble, I will deliver thee, and thou shalt glorify me;' or if we refer to Old Testament instances, such as Abraham pleading that the threatened judgments should be averted from the guilty cities of the plain; or Moses pleading for success against Amalek, and that the plagues might be stayed; or David praying for recovery from affliction, or for the removal of the pestilence from his people, etc.,—we shall probably be told that those were imperfect dispensations; that God treated his
servants

servants according to the imperfect ideas then entertained, and thus encouraged them to believe that calamities were removed, and temporal mercies bestowed, in direct answer to their supplications, but that we have got beyond all this, and that no such things are to be taught, and no such interpositions to be expected now. If it should be said to us expressly, 'The examples of Old Testament saints are not for our imitation here, the precepts given to them are not for our guidance, the promises they received are not for our encouragement; that it might be proper to plead for and to expect such things in those times, but that it is not so now, after a more elevated, pure, and spiritual economy has been introduced;' this would almost lead us to reply that the noblest dispensation which God has ever given to man—that which presents the consummation of his designs—seems as if, by this view, it was taking away some part of his authority and influence from the world he governs, and depriving his servants of one great privilege with which in former times they were favoured, of considering all their interests as under the direction of God, presenting to him all their wants with the hope of a gracious attention to all their desires.

But when we come to examine the New Testament writings, we do not find this change that is spoken of; on the contrary, we hear 'the great Teacher' directing his disciples to pray that their Father which is in heaven would give them 'day by day their daily bread.' After his ascension to heaven, and the pouring out of the Spirit, we are told of the church at Jerusalem uniting in prayer for the liberation of one of the Apostles from prison. The greatest of the Apostles informs us that when he was afflicted with the thorn in the flesh, for this thing he besought the Lord thrice, that it might be taken from him; he intreats the Christians at Rome to pray for him, that he might be delivered from those that did not believe in Judea; and when he was a prisoner, he exhorted the Hebrew Christians to pray for him, that he might be restored to them the sooner. He exhorts Christians in general to 'be careful for nothing, but in everything by prayer and supplication, with thanksgiving, to make their requests known unto God.' The Apostle James exhorts Christians to 'pray for one another, that they may be healed;' presenting in connection with this the important declaration—'The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much;' illustrating this by an instance taken from the Old Testament Scriptures, in which prayer prevailed to bring a temporal calamity on the Israelites as a punishment for their sins, and in which it was again heard for the removal of the judgment. The Apostle Peter directs Christians to 'cast all their care upon God, for He careth for them.'

Thus we perceive that in connection with all the spiritual nature and designs of the new dispensation, and all the full and glorious discoveries it makes of the plan of redeeming mercy, with all its grand results in eternity, it recognizes all the great principles made known under former dispensations, as to the providential government of God, His attention to all our concerns, our constant dependence upon Him in the affairs of the present life, with the privilege of presenting before Him in prayer all our temporal as well as spiritual interests, attended with

with a full belief that we shall be heard and answered in all these things so far as infinite wisdom shall see best ; that while our spiritual concerns are to be supreme, our temporal affairs are not beneath the notice of our God, nor will our prayers for inferior blessings be ever disregarded by Him.

It might not be improper to inquire here whether there is in reality any essential difference between the present and former dispensations as to the connection between the prevalence of religion amongst a people, and their temporal prosperity, or their disregard to it with temporal calamity ? It is frequently stated that the promised rewards of piety in former times related more to temporal blessings, and the threatenings for the neglect of it to temporal calamities. The full discussion of this would require more space than it would be suitable to occupy in this paper : a brief remark or two must suffice.

If an appeal were made to the personal history of the servants of God and to the records of their experience, together with the general and particular statements that are made concerning their earthly condition under the former dispensations, it would fully appear that personal piety did not exempt its possessors from afflictions and sorrows. It was true then, as well as now, that 'the Lord tried the righteous,' that 'many were the afflictions of the righteous,' that the wicked often appeared to prosper, while the righteous were depressed ; that the great rewards of piety were spiritual and eternal ; *then* it was the chief glory of the servants of the Lord to be authorized to say, 'This God is our God, for ever and ever ; He will be our guide even unto death.'

In reference to the Jewish nation, promises were given that if they refrained from idolatry and observed the laws of their God, prosperity should attend them as a people ; but that if they disobeyed the Divine will, and went after the idols of the heathen, judgments should come upon them. But it may be asked, Is not this the principle of the Divine government over nations in all ages ? especially where a people are favoured with a revelation of the will of God ? When righteousness prevails, prosperity is the result ; when immorality, pride, and oppression prevail, God has a controversy with that people, and will punish them for their iniquity. One great reason of this may be, that, as nations, they can only be rewarded or punished in the present state. When a people, generally, become corrupt, oppressive, and impure, there are national sins, calling for national judgments. In some instances there is the leaven of piety working, as it exists in the servants of God, preserving the state from utter corruption ; and their examples and prayers are noticed and accepted as the means of averting threatened judgments and of restoring forfeited blessings. They sometimes stand in the gap, and seem to be permitted to stay the uplifted hand of righteous vengeance. An examination of the prophetic Scriptures which relate to other nations beside the Jews, will, we think, quite sustain the remark that the principle of the Divine government of nations is to punish or reward in the present state, in their collective capacity. Personal retributions are chiefly in the future world ; national retributions are to be endured in the present state. 'The

Lord

Lord reigneth, let the earth rejoice.' 'The Lord reigneth, let the people tremble.'

From this digression we now return to notice some objections which are made to the offering of prayer for the removal of temporal calamities, etc., and expecting answers to such prayers. It is objected that such calamities will prevail where the laws of nature are transgressed, and that the only way to escape them is to act in accordance with those laws, and that prayer is presumption while these are neglected. In reply it may be fully stated that there are undoubtedly many evils now suffered which might be avoided by a prudent attention to the dictates of nature and reason; and that it is never pleaded that prayer is to be substituted for a regard to these things; or that it is to furnish an excuse for the neglect of them. But this does not, as we perceive, in the least degree exclude the use and the efficacy of prayer as one of the means which God has ordained. The same objection might be made to the employment of prayer to obtain deliverance from spiritual evils. We can no more expect such evils to be removed while we continue to transgress the laws of the spiritual economy, than we can in relation to temporal affairs. It would be as great presumption to pray to God to deliver us from temptations to sin, if we refuse to watch over the state of our hearts, and if we run into those scenes which must be attended with moral danger to us, as it would be to pray for the removal of temporal evils when we neglect all suitable means for their prevention. But if in the one case this furnishes no valid reason for a disbelief in the value and efficacy of prayer as one means of Divine appointment, no more can it do so in the other.

It may also be observed that there are many temporal calamities which no human foresight can prevent; which no diligence, prudence, economy, can avert; which lie beyond the sphere of human agency; which, though philosophy may trace them to certain causes which are in operation as laws of nature, yet seem to come at the call of God, and to go at his bidding, clearly indicating the presence and operation of the Great Ruler. This is the case with the desolating tempest, the destructive hurricane, the alarming earthquake, the destroying pestilence; and many a desolating flood of evil which comes with overwhelming force upon men, with many a fearful disease that prevails. Who could tell the direction of the dire disease which has prevailed amongst us? Was not the hand of God in it all? Is not Divine power exercised in directing, controlling, removing, such evils as these in the way of judgment and of mercy? And does He not hear and answer prayer in relation to them? If He did so in ancient times, where is the reason why He should not do it now?

But it is objected that God works by general laws in His providential government of the world; and that it is vain to suppose that He will interrupt those laws in answer to our supplications. In reply we might ask, Are there not general laws that govern the spiritual as well as the material world? And might it not be said that it is unreasonable to suppose that God will suspend or interrupt those laws to answer our particular desires, or to meet the exigencies of our minds?

If

If the objection is valid in the one case, would it not be equally so in the other? But we might further ask, Does not the Divine arrangement, both in the material and the spiritual world, include all the means which are to be employed for the fulfilment of the Divine designs? Does not His plan include all second causes and all their effects? And has He not taught us that prayer is one of those things which shall be employed as an important means for bringing about the accomplishment of many things in His general plan of providential and spiritual government? If it has efficacy in the latter, there appears to us no just reason why it should not in the former. 'He worketh all things after the counsel of His own will' in the kingdoms of nature and of grace; and this, He has taught us, makes one part of His wise and gracious counsels, that prayer shall be one means that shall be employed [by men to obtain blessings from Him; that there shall be a connection between the presenting of supplication by His fallen, dependent creatures on earth, and the bestowment of the blessings they need.

To pray with the expectation of being heard and answered, so far as our prayers may be according to the Divine will, is not to attempt to alter Divine designs, but to act in accordance with them. Not that every prayer we offer will certainly be answered in the direct bestowment of the blessing we ask; for in some things relating to the present life—owing to our short-sightedness, liability to err, selfishness, and partiality—we might ask what would prove a curse rather than a blessing; therefore we are to ask all such things with due submission to the wisdom of Him who can order all for our good and for His own glory.

But the value of prayer, it is said, lies in its promoting our moral and spiritual improvement. For this purpose it is most admirably adapted. Herein the wisdom and mercy of God remarkably shine in appointing that we should come to the Father of mercies with all our concerns. The very exercise of worship before the Divine throne, the offering of supplication to our God, must be calculated to calm and elevate our minds, to rectify their disorders, and to quicken us in the path of duty. But this surely cannot be the whole of what is meant when it is said, 'Ask, and ye shall receive.' 'Call upon me in the day of trouble, and I will deliver thee.' This was not all that the Apostle John intended when he said, 'This is the confidence that we have in Him, that if we ask anything according to His will, He heareth us: and if we know that He hear us, whatsoever we ask, we know that we have the petitions that we desired of Him.' Here we have the full assurance of an inspired writer, under the new dispensation, that whatsoever we ask according to the will of God—evidently including all that may relate to our temporal and spiritual interests—He heareth us, and we do have the petitions we desired of Him.

THOS. COLEMAN.

Ashley.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Funeral Services occasioned by the Death of the Rev. John Pye Smith, D.D., LL.D., F.R.S., F.G.S. Jackson and Walford. 1851.

SUCH a man as the late Dr. John Pye Smith ought not to pass from the earth without a record of the fact in a Journal of Sacred Literature; and we rejoice that the present publication affords us a suitable opportunity at once of satisfying a public duty, and of indulging a personal feeling. It consists of a brief account of the services at the funeral, with an oration pronounced at the interment by the Rev. George Clayton, and with a discourse delivered on the following day at the Gravel Pits Chapel (in which Dr. Smith himself had officiated for forty-seven years) by Dr. John Harris. The distinguishing feature of the work is this discourse. It is a very able and eloquent performance, honourable to the heart and mind of the distinguished author, and answerable in all respects to his high reputation.

The following passage comprises the substance of the preacher's estimate of Dr. Smith's character and labours:—

‘Those who could best appreciate him will, I think, join with me in the opinion that his mind was not distinguished by any splendid or showy attributes. The daring in imagination, the metaphysical in reasoning, and the inventive in theory, were unknown to him. But if his mental qualities were not marked by breadth and brilliance, they were characterised by strength and intensity. He united quickness of apprehension with great power of application and patient inquiry. Remarkable retentiveness of memory, and the orderly distribution of his knowledge, placed the results of his immense reading at his ready disposal. His mind was a well-arranged library, in which he could easily lay his hand on whatever he wanted. And to these qualities he added—what is rarely found in so eminent a degree in this connexion—true originality. Not that which aims at the striking, or produces the singular; but that which denotes mental independence. Whatever he produced, brought with it, both in form and in style, the stamp of his own mind.

‘But more particularly; his course was marked by unintermitting mental activity. The range of reading and study which he sketched for himself and his pupils on his first coming to Homerton, showed a determination to circumnavigate, if possible, the entire globe of knowledge. Departments of science which were then only just beginning to attract attention, were already familiar to him. The German, French, and other modern languages unlocked their stores of literature to him, at a time when the first of these especially was, in this country, almost an “unknown tongue.” Every new book of importance, however costly, was eagerly obtained, and laid under contribution in the cause of truth. And even when his growing infirmities compelled him to retire from official life, his thirst for knowledge remained unappeased. When he retired to Guildford, he entertained the hope of entering on an extensive course of reading in the ancient and modern languages.

‘Nor was this intellectual activity a life of mere abstraction, or of mental luxury. Dr. Smith valued knowledge for its useful applications. It has been said that “to write is to act.” Each of his books was an act; and an act designed to meet a want. Whether he architecturally built up the ‘Scripture Testimony to the Messiah,’ like the ancient Tabernacle of Witness, or rebuked the flippant attacks of Infidelity; whether he asserted the Sacrifice and Priesthood of Christ, exhibited the rules for the Interpretation of Prophecy, expounded the Principles of the Reformation, or enforced the claims of Evangelical Nonconformity, his aim was usefulness.

falseness of the highest order. His great work, the 'Scripture Testimony,' is universally acknowledged to be one of the greatest modern achievements of sanctified learning....

As was known Dr. Smith must have been struck with his deep conscientiousness in everything relating to truth and duty. Truth, every particle of truth, was more precious in his eyes than the dust of diamonds. It made him scrupulous in the selection of his expressions, nice in his distinctions, minute and patient in his inquiries, earnest in his inculcation on his pupils of the importance of exact knowledge, unsparing in his efforts to obtain the latest information on every branch of science, and ready to learn even from an enemy. Who ever suspected his gentle nature of entering the field of controversy, except from loyalty to truth? And, having triumphed, he ascribed his success to no skill or prowess of his, but to the awful and invincible power of Truth. And duty, all duty, was, in his eyes, clothed with sanctity. The call of duty was for him a voice from the skies; and he obeyed it with equal cheerfulness, whether it called him to the sick chamber, the humble prayer-meeting, the lecturing platform, the ameliorative or patriotic society, or to the scientific assembly....

Such unbending fidelity is not often seen in conjunction with marked kindness. But benevolence was one of Dr. Smith's characteristics. Politeness has been defined "benevolence in little things." In social life, Dr. Smith was courtesy embodied. His natural activity made him independent of giving trouble; and his kindness rendered him scrupulous of occasioning it. Highly susceptible of social pleasures, he was prompt to do all in his power to serve, and honour, and gratify those around him. Suffering of every kind awakened his sympathy; and there was no practicable sacrifice, consistent with his higher obligations, which he was not prepared to make to lighten the burdens of others. His hand was open as the day. No man more slow than he to suspect ill of another; no one more ready to put a charitable interpretation on doubtful conduct; an amiableness, it must be admitted, which laid him open occasionally to imposition. In controversy, he united the fidelity of a Luther with the gentleness of a Melancthon. Having unavoidably inflicted a wound, no one more ready than he to pour in the oil and the wine. I can hardly conceive that he ever lost a friend. And why did he take so energetic a part in the march of social reformation and general improvement—often tearing himself away from darling occupations in order to render his aid—but because he believed that he saw, in the distance, the goal towards which struggling humanity required to be conducted?

But that which formed the master-key of Dr. Smith's character was his living piety. Piety did not merely adhere to him; it pervaded and surrounded him. It was not a thing of times and places; it was the element in which he lived; and few persons could be long with him without feeling that they were breathing it. This it was which gave to his studies and movements the sanctity of devotion. "God's universe (as he beautifully said in his address at the laying the foundation-stone of New College) rises up around us—the unfathomable past, the immeasurable present, the awful future, all wrapped in the infinity of His presence." To his devout spirit the earth was a temple; and he bowed in adoration before the present God. His scientific investigations partook of the nature of worship. I speak on testimony on which I can rely, when I say that his ministrations in this sanctuary never attained a greater elevation than when he was expatiating on the glorious attributes of the Divine nature. The subject was congenial, and seemed to raise him to a mount of transfiguration from which he was loth to descend. Such was his filial confidence in God, that he was a stranger to all anxiety about earthly things and forebodings of the future. In an emphatic sense, he "walked with God;" and every part of his renewed nature was set free for the exercise, and strengthened by it. It consecrated all his learning. It kept him loyal to evangelical truth amidst many temptations to stray. It led him to insist on heavenly-mindedness as a prime qualification of a Christian minister. It invested his example with the power of a charm. It expressed itself in hourly ejaculations to God. Not only were his public intercessions rich, varied, and fervent; not only were his domestic prayers, especially (as I am informed) on the morning of the Lord's Day, marked by peculiar pathos and closeness of communion with God: his habit of private devotion overflowed into his ordinary conduct. In this manner he might

might be heard, unknown to himself, sometimes calling down blessings on his beloved friends, severally and by name; and, at others, pouring out his soul in direct adoration of the Triune God. He moved from duty to duty in the spirit of prayer. This was the golden chain by which he linked his various acts together; and the whole to the throne of God. And this devotional spirit it was which gave to his character unusual symmetry and completeness; reminding us of the Divine Model which he copied; and shedding a halo and a beauty on his earthly course.'—*Funeral Services*, pp. 41-47.

The biographical particulars given by Dr. Harris seem to be for the most part taken from a discriminating notice in the '*Leeds Mercury*,' from which, and from another Memoir in the '*Christian Times*,' the following particulars are derived:—

John Pye Smith was born at Sheffield in the year 1775. He was the only son of Mr. John Smith, a bookseller, who continued to carry on business till the time of his death, which occurred in 1810. His son received the name of John Pye from his great-uncle, the Rev. John Pye, who was a superior and accomplished person, many of whose MS. sermons are yet in possession of Dr. Smith's family. His great-nephew was engaged as a youth in his father's business; he learnt something of 'the art and mystery' of *binding* books (as well as of selling them), and was very fond, during his whole life, as a matter of recreation and amusement, of doing something of this sort. His tastes, however, were always bookish, after another fashion, and his habits studious. He was devoted to learning and fond of literary occupations and exercises.

Pye Smith's talents, distinguished piety, and ardent love of learning, clearly marked him out for the ministry, and he became a student at Rotherham College. When his own academical course was finished, his scholarship was so distinguished that he was at once chosen classical tutor of the College; and the exemplary discharge of the duties of that office, together with his theological learning and the excellence of his character, led to his being invited, at the early age of twenty-five, to become Theological Tutor and Principal of Homerton College, the oldest of the institutions for training ministers among the Independents. In January, 1801, he entered on the duties of that responsible post, and continued to discharge them, with varied incidents, though on the whole with eminent success, for fifty years; till at length, on the union of Coward, Homerton, and Highbury, and the consequent formation of New College, he retired, last Midsummer, from academic engagements and public life. He had sustained, nearly the whole time of his residence at Homerton, the office of pastor of the church assembling in the Gravel Pits Meeting-house; but from that he had retired about two years previous to the close of his college professorship.

The chief labour of Dr. Pye Smith's life, and his most enduring monument, was the work entitled '*The Scripture Testimony to the Messiah: an Inquiry with a view to a satisfactory Determination of the Doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures concerning the Person of Christ.*' This work is admitted by the greatest scholars to be the first of its kind. It is marked by profound and accurate learning, candid criticism, and by that reverential and Christian spirit which ought to govern every theological inquiry. It has received the rare honour of being admitted, though the work of a Dissenter, as an authority in the English Universities. His work on Scripture and Geology added to his theological and scientific reputation, and established his claim to a place in the Royal Society.

He also published a considerable number of separate sermons and lectures, with some volumes of controversy. Should his course of divinity be given to the world, as many competent persons have expressed the opinion that it ought, we believe it will greatly add to his fame and his usefulness. It is stated that he was never satisfied to go through his divinity lectures unimproved, but constantly amended them as new lights were thrown on Scripture.

The taste of Dr. Smith was severe and even fastidious. Partly from this cause, and partly from not being a ready penman, his composition was slow. His style was clear and elegant, but rather wanting in flow and force. Everything that proceeded from his pen bore the evidence of careful and patient thought.

Notwithstanding his peaceful temper, Dr. Smith shrunk not from controversy when occasion offered. But it is remarked that in all his intellectual combats he conducted himself as a Christian cavalier, '*sans peur et sans reproche*.'

With a dauntless moral courage Dr. Pye Smith united one of the gentlest and meekest spirits that ever dwelt in a human breast. Even a personal stranger might trace this in any letter from his pen. Even in manners he was elaborately polite—what is called 'of the old school;' and this went with him into controversy, so that he often conducted it with all the expressions of the most polished courtesy. His first work was a series of 'Letters to Mr. Belsham,' the once well-known Socinian minister of Essex Street, and was so pervaded by the property referred to, that it gave offence to some of the ruder sort: hence Andrew Fuller criticised it by saying, '*That was not the way Peter addressed heretics; he did not say to Simon Magus, "My dear Sir, pardon my apprehensions, but I fear you are under some serious mistake:" no, his words were thunder and fire—"Thou child of the devil—enemy of all righteousness—how long wilt thou continue to pervert the true ways of the Lord?"*'

Dr. Smith, on leaving Homerton, removed to Guildford, in Surrey, and had large plans laid out for courses of reading, which would probably have required some years to complete. His last effort was to republish a little work on the 'Reasons of Protestantism,' with notes suitable to the present crisis—one of the best, most comprehensive, and most suggestive of the works that have appeared on Popery. He rapidly declined towards the close of the year. He came up and partook of the communion, with his old friends and former charge, on the first Sabbath in January, 'delighting thus, once more, to renew that holy act of communion which foreshadowed their ultimate union in heaven!' On the 8th of January he publicly received, from the hands of his friends and former pupils, a testimonial of regard, at a public meeting held at the City of London Tavern:—

'Many of you,' says Dr. Harris to his audience, 'will remember his wasted but almost ethereal appearance on the day when he received the testimonial of our veneration and affection.* He had come to London the week before. During that visit he was expressing to some members of his family the extreme difficulty he felt in replying to his numerous correspondents. And to show that he could scarcely guide the pen without the help of his left hand, he traced some marks on a paper lying near. On subsequent examination these marks proved to be portions of 1 John iii. 2—"To be like him; to see him as he is."—p. 48.

It is added that—

'He deeply felt the kindness of his friends relative to the presentation of the testimonial, and the prospect of it almost overpowered him. After the scene was over, however, although his deafness had prevented him from hearing anything, he made no inquiry respecting what had been said, nor any specific reference to the meeting, except to express the pleasure of having recognised the countenances of so many old friends....

'On that day month he departed. No special disease invaded his frame. But, on returning to Guildford, the powers of life rapidly declined. "Thanks for your encouragement (he said, when a hope was expressed that he might yet revive); if so, well; if God order otherwise, I shall bless him in either, in every case." During the last six days, the only method of communication left to his sorrowing

* This refers to the sum of 2600*l.* raised by subscription; the interest to be received by him during life, and afterwards to revert to the uses of the New College St. John's Wood.

family was by writing, and offering to his eye, a few words of Scripture, for which he expressed hearty thanks.

'Looking intensely with his mild eyes in the faces of all who surrounded his dying bed, he made a last effort to bless them. "The Lord bless you all (said he), and He undoubtedly will." To a medical friend he articulated with great difficulty, "Farewell; I am greatly obliged; the eternal God be thy Refuge!" And, turning to his son, "The Lord be your portion for ever!" And thus (though he still lingered a short time), like his Divine Master, he may be said to have ascended in the act of blessing.'—pp. 49, 50.

In the published notices there is but little allusion to the fact that for many years Dr. Smith had laboured under the severe affliction of deafness to such an extent, that he could only hear what was said to him through an ear-trumpet. To this it is owing that we had not the privilege of knowing Dr. Smith personally; as interviews between one totally and another partially deaf, promised nothing but pain to both. But we occasionally corresponded with him in reference to undertakings in Biblical literature, in all of which he felt a warm and generous interest, and to one of which (the 'Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature') he contributed papers of great value. We may be permitted to add, as a characteristic mark of his humble estimate of all his own doings, which others esteemed so highly, that he could not be prevailed upon to accept more than half the remuneration to which he was entitled, but which he thought 'far more than anything written by him could ever merit.' We have only to add our earnest hope that Dr. Smith's course of Collegiate Lectures will be speedily published. From what we have heard of them, and from the eminent attainments of their author, we feel assured that the work will be looked for with eagerness and received with high satisfaction by the theological public of all denominations.

A Christian Jew on the Old Testament Scriptures. By BENJAMIN WEISS. Dundee: William Middleton.

THE author of this unpretending little volume, previous to his going forth as a missionary to his brethren according to the flesh, has given to the world a brief exposition of some of the most prominent facts and doctrines of Old Testament Scripture. To every one taking the least concernment in such subjects the opinions of an intelligent Christian Jew on the Old Testament can never be devoid of interest. To witness the effect produced by the light of the later revelation on such an individual's views of the more ancient one; to mark the struggle between early, deep-rooted prejudices on the one hand, and the new and altogether diverse influences to which he is subjected on the other; these can never be matters of indifference to the thoughtful mind. It is chiefly with such an aim that we would recommend our readers to turn their attention to the work before us. When we state that Mr. Weiss begins with the creation of the world, and ends with Israel's future prospects, it will be seen that the subjects discussed are neither wanting in number nor variousness. The volume is a perfect *multum in parvo*; and although we decidedly demur to many of the points sought to be established by the author, yet we feel bound to accord him the praise of possessing a shrewd and ingenious turn of mind, a healthful, evangelical piety, and a thorough familiarity with the word of God. As perhaps may be expected, Mr. Weiss is a sturdy battler for the all perfect fidelity of the present Hebrew text, in opposition to those who would seek its amendment; among other things, in chrono-

logy, by comparing it with the Septuagint and other versions. It is therefore small matter of surprise to find him seriously labouring to identify Melchisedek with Shem, or taking it for granted that actually fifty thousand threescore and ten of the men of Bethshemesh were smitten for violating the sanctity of the ark. On the vexed question of the *Scapegoat* he very strongly affirms the identity of Azazel and Satan, while at the same time as strongly repudiating Hengstenberg's notion of the Egyptian origin of that impressive ceremony. On the *Urim and Thummim* he gives the Rabbinical (though not altogether unlikely) explanation of a miraculous darkening of the breastplate-stones, previously illuminated by means of a lamp with twelve lights. In chap. xix., speaking of the 'baptisms and lustrations under the law,' Mr. W. enters into an examination of the confessedly obscure phrase of St. Paul in his Epistle to the Corinthians—'baptized for the dead.' The exposition of the passage is as follows, and is not unworthy of attention :—

'The Apostle Paul, in his First Epistle unto the Corinthians, pleads with those individuals of that Church who disbelieved his testimony regarding the resurrection of the dead and eternal life. Among other reasons which he produces in proof of that solemn truth, we find him expressing himself in the following words :—"If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable" (1 Cor. xv. 19). After having showed them that in Christ we have to expect everlasting life, and that as he is the first-born from the dead, so they that are his members will rise and reign with him in eternity, the Apostle then goes on with his argument in the following words :—"Else what shall they do which are baptized for (or on account of) the dead, if the dead rise not at all? Why are they then baptized for (or on account of) the dead? And why stand we in jeopardy every hour?" (1 Cor. xv. 29, 30). In this part of the argument Paul includes the three different baptisms, and the ambassadors by whom these baptisms were preached, and on whose testimonies they were performed. He shows that all these baptisms, whether preached by Moses and his disciples, John and his disciples, or by Jesus and his disciples, must stand in special relation to eternity, and not to this world only. They must be preparations for a better world to come, for they teach a separation from this world. The self-denials, sufferings, and afflictions which they who follow the invitation and footsteps of the ambassadors of God have to undergo in this life, must surely have their reward in a world to come. Else those followers of God's call must be, of all men, most miserable, having sacrificed all the enjoyments of this life, and having no hope with regard to the future. But as these servants of God, who invited men to come and follow them, have shown the same example, in denying themselves the pleasures of this world, in order to enjoy a happy eternity; so those who follow them and their doctrines must believe that the fruits of faith will be reaped in the resurrection of the dead and in eternity. This is evidently the aim of Paul's argument when he says, "Else (viz., if there be no resurrection nor any reward in eternity) what shall they do which are baptized 'for' the dead?" or "which are baptized on account of the dead," viz., on account of the testimony of the ambassadors of God, who are now dead, and who enjoyed no good during their lifetime—as Moses, John, and even Christ, and some of his disciples, who were dead at that time when Paul wrote that Epistle. "What shall they do which followed the example of those heroes, and were baptized unto them and their testimony, and denied themselves likewise of every pleasure and comfort of this life? When shall their fidelity be rewarded, if the dead rise not at all?"—pp. 141-2.

The chapters on the 'Ark, Mercy-seat, and Cherubim,' are well prepared, and will repay a perusal. On the whole, we are sure our readers will feel interested in Mr. Weiss's 'critical investigations,' and learn, from an acquaintance with the volume containing them,

to esteem the writer both on account of his gifts and his graces. And we may add that personal intercourse with him would only serve to strengthen the favourable impression which his work wherever it goes will create.

Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Thomas Chalmers, D.D., LL.D. By his Son-in-law, the Rev. WILLIAM HANNA, LL.D. Vols. I. and II. Sutherland and Knox. Edinburgh. 1849-50.

WE have read these volumes with the highest interest. The great popularity of the Memoirs of Chalmers is not surprising, and it is impossible to calculate the amount of good likely to be realised by their publication. We purpose giving a more extended notice when the entire narrative is before the public; but we take the liberty, at present, of saying that the excellent and talented biographer is prejudicing the success of his work by the undue delay of the appearance of the third volume. The narrative reaches only to the close of the pastoral labours of Dr. Chalmers in Glasgow, in 1823, leaving, we imagine, sufficient matter for two volumes of equal size with those published. The work will take its place among biographies of permanent interest and value to the Christian Church, but in proportion to the interest presently felt in the Memoirs will be the desire for their speedy completion.

De Novi Testamenti versione Syriaca Antiqua quam Peshitho vocant Libri Quatuor. Scripsit JOHANNES WICHELHAUS, Theologiæ Licentiatius in Academia Halensi. Halis Typis et impensis Orphanotropei. A. MDCCCL. 8vo. London, Dulau and Co.

IN this volume the author treats of not a few subjects besides the Peshito-Syriac Version. His first book is devoted to the Aramean language and its various dialects. In this portion of the work he treats of the native country and original limits of the Aramean tongue, —of its use in the empire of the Assyrians, of the Chaldeans, and of the Persians, —of its use in the time of the Seleucidæ, and under the Romans: he then passes on to the characteristics and the dialects of the tongue itself.

The second book discusses the Church of the Syrians and the origin of the Peshito-Syriac Version. This latter subject the author is, of course, obliged to leave just in the same obscurity as he found it. It may be said of most ancient versions that at a particular period we have evidence that they were in use, but farther in general we cannot go: who executed them, or the precise date, are points which remain wholly undetermined.

To this book is appended an interesting *excursus* on Mesopotamia in the early centuries of our era, and on the subject of King Abgarus.

In the third book the author takes up the literary history of the Peshito version; its use amongst Nestorians and Eutychians; on the most ancient MSS. of the Gospels brought from the East; the readings

ings found in Nestorian copies; the readings found in Eutychiean copies; and the editions of the Syriac New Testament.

In treating of Syriac MSS. the author's literary horizon would have been vastly extended had he made any inquiry as to *what* the MSS. are which (as he mentions) have been brought to the British Museum from the Nitrian monasteries.

The concluding book treats of the nature, authority, and use of the Peshito version. Here the author shows plainly how highly he esteems this translation, as it has come down to us in the common printed copies. It is hardly too much to say that he would exalt it as the standard by which to judge of all other forms in which the sacred text has been transmitted. He thus sets himself in opposition to almost every textual critic who has treated on this subject. Wichelhaus rests on the *antiquity* of the version, and then appears to us to assume that it must have come down to us in exactly the same condition as it was in at first. How far this can be reconciled with the fact that it *often* differs from almost all other ancient authorities, and agrees with those that are more recent, it is not for us to say. Wichelhaus has *heard* of the Syriac MS. of the Gospels which the Rev. W. Cureton intends to publish, and he has had the boldness (we might say *temerity*) to pass a judgment on its text, merely because he has been informed that its readings differ from the Peshito.

As a work of general information this has considerable value. It is written, too, in a reverential spirit, such as is becoming when Holy Scripture is under discussion. Some of the author's observations on the use of the Peshito, as an authority for various readings, are good.

It is probable that no author of due intelligence and diligence writes a monograph on some particular ancient version, without succeeding in thus giving a far more intelligible notion of such a version than could be gathered from scattered notices; and if such a writer should so warn with his subject as to overestimate its value and authority, surely a critic must be very cold who would altogether blame this enthusiasm.

In speaking of the editions of the New Testament in Syriac, it is remarkable that Wichelhaus dates the first (that of Widmanstadt) 1561 instead of 1555. The date 1561 was afterwards added to some of the copies. He appears to omit altogether the convenient and useful edition superintended by the late Mr. Greenfield—an omission all the more serious, as this edition gives the general student, who has not access to Widmanstadt's comparatively expensive edition, the Syriac text of that edition. The last impression that he notices is one got out by the American Missionary Society at Urmia, for the use of the Nestorians in that region. Of this he says, '*Cujus tamen exemplaria per pauca nostras in regiones translata sunt.*' We believe that a single leaf sent to Professor Rödiger of Halle is all that Wichelhaus has seen of this edition: as actually published in the East, of course a good deal of interest attaches to it.

Salvation: a Sermon preached in the Parish Church of Crathie, Balmoral, before her Majesty the Queen, Sunday, September 22nd, 1850. By the Rev. JOHN CUMMING, D.D. Seventeenth Thousand. Arthur Hall, Virtue and Co. 1851.

HAD we read the above sermon without its title we might have disposed of it in a few words, as one among the preacher's numerous published compositions, and as a unit among the thousands that issue from the press in general. It has, however, distinct claims to attention. It was preached before the Queen by a minister of the Church of Scotland. It is now being preached widely to the public, as nearly seventeen thousand copies are in circulation. But more than this—it has had the good or bad fortune to be pettishly attacked in an obscure party journal.

The ordinary reader of the sermon will pronounce it a good average effort of a teacher of acknowledged ability—a composition that disarms criticism, as it makes no lofty pretensions, and touches upon practical rather than controversial topics; but the censorious writer alluded to has discovered in these thirty pages all that is unsound in theology, all that is vicious in style, and all that is 'loathsome,' by the bad taste indicated. He questions the right of the preacher to have preached it; of the printer to have printed it, and of the public to read it. We cannot but admire the penetration of this critic. He seems to have such a far-seeing eye for private arrangements, that he could doubtless employ the same faculty to 'advantage in seeing through a brickwall. We happen to be well informed upon most of the circumstances connected with the delivery of this discourse, and can state, on the best authority, that the allegations referred to are contrary to fact, and that the witticisms have missed fire. Dr. Cumming simply occupied a pulpit in his native land belonging to the communion of which he has throughout rejoiced in continuing a member. What he then preached, we can state with confidence, had the Royal approbation at the time, which has since been repeated on more than one occasion.

We have styled this a discourse that disarms criticism, and we will endeavour to explain our meaning. The preacher has evidently adopted his usual style with which he would address any mixed congregation, and was apparently unconscious that he was in the presence of princes or courtiers. When Charles I. listened to the University preacher at Oxford, the very text was made the vehicle of gross flattery—'Blessed is the king that cometh in the name of the Lord.' When at a different period he was constrained to hear a Puritan instructor, he received lessons, political and personal, more wholesome perhaps than pleasant. Dr. Cumming avoided any approximation to either course. He felt that he had an opportunity of preaching the Gospel untainted by fashionable errors, and he did so. He did it in his own way. He gave expression to truth according to his own lucid mode of thought, and riveted the attention of his auditors by his usual rapid succession of metaphors and illustrations. We may for a moment allude to the latter, as they afforded to the critic the most vulnerable point. It ought

ought to be remembered that in enforcing truth the preacher mainly desires to leave a distinct impression, and regards this of greater importance than the consideration of the precise mode of accomplishing his object. We believe that in this Dr. Cumming is eminently successful. He brings to bear every collateral idea on which he can lay his hand. History, ancient and modern; science, abstract and experimental; customs, social and domestic; Scotland, and its lovely scenes; England, and its happy homes; civilization, and its railroads; savage life, and its wigwams; France, with its revolutions; China, with its changeless laws: a world of things, social and domestic, are pressed into the service. The imagination is made to wander to the confines of the earth and the depths of the ocean, and to the locale of the remotest star, but is instantly brought back to the main truth which is intended to be enforced. Had the Balmoral sermon pretended to be a polished oration, such as might be addressed to an assembled university, Dr. Cumming would have been the first to admit its defects: as it happens to have been a plain discourse, preached to the parishioners of a Highland parish, of whom the Queen is one, and with whom she was glad to worship, we must regard the strictures of the critic as superfluous, and believe that Dr. Cumming's modest aim has been blessed with extended usefulness.

Lectures for the Times; or, Illustrations and Refutations of the Errors of Romanism and Tractarianism. By the Rev. JOHN CUMMING, D.D. Arthur Hall, Virtue and Co. London. 1851.

THIS is by no means the first time that Dr. Cumming has presented himself to the Christian public as the avowed opponent of Romanism, nor is this volume the first-fruit of his laborious researches in the field of controversy—a fact in itself calculated to increase our confidence in the stability of his opinions, and to explain the virulent invectives heaped upon him by the subjects of his animadversions.

We are inclined to regard these lectures as happy specimens of the eloquence that naturally arises from spontaneity of thought and perfect acquaintance with the topic under discussion. Nor must we omit to notice the absence of personality and vindictiveness—blots that have too often stigmatized the overzealous efforts of some who forget that Goliath must be assailed with no weapon from the forge of human invention or human tradition, but with the smooth stone from the brook, that is, the word of the Spirit.

The book contains fourteen lectures, two of which were delivered at the Hanover Rooms in the autumn of 1850—an autumn rendered memorable by the protests that issued from countless voices against the threatened infliction of a Roman hierarchy. To this subject the first two sections, on the Cardinal and his Oath, bear special reference, showing, as the necessary results of Papal supremacy, that the purity of our firesides will be defiled, the whole texture of social life disturbed, and a dishonour placed upon Him whose glory it is our first duty to seek, and ought to be our last effort to defend.

The remaining sections are principally devoted to the consideration
of

of the leading points of error wherein we dissent from Rome, and Rome from the Scripture. That on Tractarianism will be read with additional interest if we admit, as many have done, that the inherent affinity between Oxford and Rome was the inciting cause of a Cardinal's invasion. Those sections, where an endeavour is made to dislodge Rome from her supposed stronghold, exhibit much able argument. Of these, the tenth is a proof of the extent and zeal with which Dr. Cumming has pursued his polemical researches, not for the purpose of arming himself with the authority of the Fathers (which is Rome's panoply), but to prove, by the incoherency of tradition, the futility of the claim which she has made to the supreme headship of the Church. Dr. Cumming justly remarks that 'unity is not uniformity;' yet even in this self-styled infallible Church there has been less uniformity than in any other—witness the seventy schisms enumerated in Clement's Second Epistle. Uniformity is not God's will; it is by diversities of outward constitution that the truths of Christianity are held prominent and distinct; it is by many outward manifestations and developments of the Catholic Church that the whole Catholic truth of God is preserved. The uniformity that Rome aims at is the same in the nineteenth as it was in the fourth century—spiritual despotism and temporal ambition. Nor are there wanting witnesses to her corruptions who have come out of her after having suffered for the cause of truth. It is no slight usurpation over the souls and bodies of men that has made such dissenters as Dr. Achilli and Father Gavazzi. In addition to the extrinsic interest attached to this volume, we may remark, that as it meets most of the difficulties suggested by Romanists and sceptics, it may be regarded as a suitable work to be placed in the hands of those who are wavering on the brink of error, and will be hailed as such by all lovers of Protestant truth.

Prophetic Studies; or, Lectures on the Book of Daniel. By the Rev. JOHN CUMMING, D.D. London. Arthur Hall, Virtue and Co. 1850.

THE days in which we live are likely to occupy a prominent page in future history, if indeed the stage itself do not disappear in which the exciting scenes follow each other in such rapid succession. The political movements of 1848, when 'the sea and the waves were roaring, and men's hearts were failing them for fear,' have been followed by religious movements of still deeper significance. During the present year we might fancy that the nations were minded to be somewhat more joyous. There is built for their reception a large house of glass, to which they have sent 'their merchandise of gold and silver, and precious stones, and of pearls, and fine linen, and purple and silk and scarlet, and all thyine wood, and all manner vessels of ivory, and all manner vessels of most precious wood, and of brass and iron and marble;' but as a glass palace would be of little use in a siege, so the festivities of the world have little influence in postponing those momentous controversies on which its destinies hang. Gardens and orchards smile on the slopes of a volcano at the eve of an eruption.

We

We cannot but think that Dr. Cumming has chosen a suitable juncture for calling the attention of men to the prophecies of the book of Daniel. It is well for those who advocate Popery on the banks of the Tiber, or Protestantism on the banks of the Thames, to listen to the voice which spake from the Tigris. The book of Daniel is the Apocalypse of the Old Testament. The holy seer viewed from the cradle of the human race the rise and fall of monarchies and priesthoods. There is a majesty in his prophecy, a rude grandeur in his descriptions, at the same time that there is an accuracy of detail and a distinctness of chronology that leave no room for doubting the subsequent fulfilment. Indeed, this has been made an argument against the genuineness of the composition. Dr. Lardner has collected the objections which Porphyry alleged on this very principle, asserting that they were not composed by Daniel, but by some person who lived in Judæa about the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. Jerome answered these arguments, as also Methodius, Eusebius, and Apollinarius; but to ourselves the answers are of less importance than the fact of the controversy, which is in itself the most conclusive proof that the prophecy was genuine and its fulfilment exact. Further proofs are given in the commencing lecture of this series, derived from external as well as internal evidence, amply refuting the Jew who fears the testimony afforded to a suffering Messiah, as well as the neologian who strives to undermine everything in the Scriptures which claims to be miraculous or supernatural.

The book of Daniel may be divided into two parts. The first is chiefly historical, and contains a relation of various circumstances that happened to the prophet and his fellow-captives under several kings at Babylon. This portion includes Nebuchadnezzar's dream, which was strictly prophetic, referring, as it did, to the four empires, beginning with the head of gold (the Babylonian empire), and extending to the ten toes of iron and clay (the ten kingdoms of the Roman empire), together with the stone cut out of the mountain without hands, which brake in pieces the iron, the brass, the clay, the silver, and the gold. Fifteen out of twenty-eight of Dr. Cumming's lectures embrace this historical portion, the prophetic chapter (Dan. ii.) supplying matter for the fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth. The second portion of the book is strictly prophetic, and comprises the visions and prophecies with which Daniel was favoured, and which enabled him to foretell numerous important events relative to the monarchies of the world, the time of the advent and death of the Messiah, the restoration of the Jews, and the conversion of the Gentiles. The last three chapters, which contain Daniel's fourth and last prophetic vision, are apparently reserved for a future volume. The ninth forms the subject of the lectures from the nineteenth to the twenty-eighth inclusive. The eighteenth is given up to the vision of the ram and he-goat. Of this lecture we may remark that it is one of the most important and interesting of the series. Dr. Cumming has adopted Mr. Faber's view of the little horn which rises out of the fourth horn of the Macedonian empire, and shows with considerable clearness that neither Antiochus Epiphanes

Epiphanes was intended nor the Roman empire, but the great Mahomedan imposture. Hence he gives to this lecture 'The Moslem' as its heading.

No one can read Bishop Newton's dissertation without being convinced that Antiochus but ill accords with the features of the prophecy. It is enough to observe that a 'horn' never represents in prophetic language an individual, but a power. It is equally evident that events are alluded to which spread over a greater surface of the world's history. Bishop Newton's argument for applying the prophecy to the Roman empire derives its chief strength from the correspondence of much of Daniel's language with the predictions of our Lord concerning the destruction of Jerusalem. Thus of the horn it is said (Dan. viii. 10), 'It waxed great even to the host of heaven; and it cast down some of the host and of the stars to the ground, and stamped upon them.' Our Lord uses the expression (Matt. xxiv. 29), 'The stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken.' And the king of fierce countenance (ver. 23) seems to correspond to the well-ascertained prediction (Deut. xxviii. 50), 'A nation of fierce countenance, which shall not regard the person of the old nor show favour to the young.' It is equally easy to refer to the destruction of Jerusalem—'By him the daily sacrifice was taken away, and the place of his sanctuary was cast down' (ver. 11). But the Bishop's argument is felt to be inadequate, when he attempts to account for the Roman power springing up in a part of the world wholly detached from the Macedonian empire. The Scriptural description is clear enough—'*Out of one of them* (the four horns) came forth a little horn, which waxed exceeding great' (ver. 9). Bishop Newton quotes the angel's explanation (vv. 21, 22), and says, 'The first great horn was the kingdom of Alexander and his family. The four horns were four kingdoms, not of his family, but only of the nation. Four kingdoms shall stand up out of the nation; and doth not this imply that the remaining kingdom, the kingdom of the "little horn," should be not of the nation?' ('Newton on the Prophecies,' Dissertation xv.) We cannot see the force of this reasoning, but it appears to us that Mr. Faber, and with him Dr. Cumming, is quite correct in looking for the rise of some power in the territory governed by Alexander. Another argument against the little horn signifying the Roman empire is, that that power has been already described by the prophet under the emblem of 'the fourth beast, dreadful and terrible;' and it would seem quite inconsistent to introduce a new figure, which implies a power of a less formidable character. A comparison of the two 'little horns'—that of chap. viii. with that of chap. vii.—suggests certain analogies which will help to clear up the mystery. One is a horn springing out of the Macedonian empire, the other out of the Roman. The former is spoken of as 'understanding dark sentences,' the latter as 'a mouth speaking great things.' The Macedonian horn is 'mighty, but not by his own power;' and by that power 'cast down some of the host and of the stars to the ground, and magnified himself against the prince of the host.' The Roman horn 'speaks great words against the

the Most High, and wears out the saints of the Most High.' Now, it is clear from this comparison that, whilst there is resemblance in certain features between the two, they are by no means identical. We are disposed to form this conclusion:—Each horn implies a great system of religious imposture subduing the souls of men, and making use of a power 'not its own' (viz., the secular arm) to persecute the saints of God. They would appear to rise nearly at the same time, and their last end will as nearly synchronize. They both profess divine revelations, and affect the possession of dark mysteries, whilst both are Antichristian and blasphemous. The one is the great Eastern imposture, or Mahommedanism, taking its rise in the Syrian territory; the other is the great Western imposture, or Popery, taking its rise in Italy. Dr. Cumming has the advantage of a reference to recent events in showing how Faber's theory is every day becoming more probable. He shows that the 2300 years, at the end of which the little horn was to fail, terminates most probably about the year 1820. With reference to this, he says:—

'Turkey begins to hear the knell of its approaching doom, and piecemeal, year by year, it falls to ruin; and every one who reads the present history of that country knows that every day some new revolutionary reform is taking place in its government. The paddle-wheel disturbs the silence of its waters; the European engineer is invited to Constantinople; Protestant residents are multiplying in every direction in the midst of it; the Sultan is casting off the dress, the forms, the ceremonies, the habits of the Turk; it is ceasing to be a capital crime for a Turk to become a Christian. The Sultan has given leave to the Jews to build a temple, if they please, in the midst of Jerusalem; and only lately her Majesty's representative at the court of the Sultan secured rights and privileges for all denominations of Christians, and for those of the ancient Armenian churches, utterly incompatible with the essential principles of the Koran—"it dies without hand."—*Lectures on Daniel*, p. 275.

In his seventeenth lecture Dr. Cumming confesses a difficulty in the interpretation of the Son of Man coming to the Ancient of Days. He is not willing to believe the Ancient of Days to be other than the second person of the Trinity. He thus states his consequent dilemma:—

'Herein is the difficulty, because the portrait of the first-mentioned personage is unquestionably that of our blessed Lord. If so, how can he be said to be brought before the Ancient of Days? I admit and feel the difficulty. I cannot explain it.'—p. 252.

We, too, confess a difficulty in applying to the Father a description which corresponds so nearly to that of the Saviour (Rev. i. 14) in the Apocalypse; but the best interpreters are all but unanimous in doing so. Grotius, Lowth, Henry, Bishop Hall, Pearson, Scott, and a host of others, acknowledge no hesitation. Dr. Owen argues that in general Christ was the Person revealed in vision; but that in certain instances, of which this is an example, it was the Father who manifested himself. With regard to 'one like unto the Son of Man,' alluded to in this passage, being the Messiah, Poole (*Poli Synopsis in loco*) says,—*'Omnes veteres et recensioes Doctores Messiam intelligunt.'* He alludes to the suggestion that one like unto the Son of Man may refer
to

to a community, but remarks,—‘Ineptum est et insolens; populum integrum voce *fili hominis* notari.’

We would gladly quote more largely from these interesting lectures. They present in an engaging form all that is valuable and well ascertained in the researches of prophetic scholars; while at the same time lessons are interspersed of a more practical nature, lifting the mind out of the mists of controversy, strengthening the faith, and enkindling the devout affections.

Discourses on some of the most Difficult Texts of Scripture. By the Rev. JAMES COCHRANE, A.M. Edinburgh. Putnam and Ritchie. 1851.

THE nature of the ‘difficulties’ which this volume undertakes to elucidate will be shown from the titles of the discourses it contains—eighteen in number:—The Church’s Foundation Rock and the Gates of Hell; The Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven; Irretrievable Apostasy; Salted with Fire; Christ went and preached to the Spirits in Prison; Baptized for the Dead; General View of the Doctrine of God’s Eternal Decrees; Sovereignty of God in Predestination; Sovereignty of God in Election; Doctrine of Election practically considered; Sovereignty of God in Reprobation; On the Difficulties in the Ninth Chapter of Romans; The two Genealogies of Christ compared; The Title on the Saviour’s Cross; The Election of Matthias; and three upon the Sin against the Holy Ghost.

With these really important, and (some of them) truly difficult subjects, Mr. Cochrane grapples in a most resolute spirit. They will be much mistaken who suppose that this author gets over the difficulties he has voluntarily confronted by the usual process of attenuation and lubrication. This is not his cue. He shrinks not from following every position boldly to its most rigid consequences; and having shown what, in regard to these high matters, the Scripture does in his view mean, he, like Paul, anticipates all objection by crying out ‘Nay, but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God?’ He does not, in fact, contemplate any difficulty in the consequences hardest to flesh and blood of the doctrines he upholds, nor avert his eyes from the austere consequences of the absolute ‘decrees.’ He seems, indeed, cast in the same mould with those old theologians who—often themselves tender and loving in their human relations—could regard not only without pain, but with positive satisfaction, the glory of God magnified and his justice vindicated in the condemnation of the non-elect, and could hear without concern the roaring of the eternal flames to which they were consigned. This resolute doctrine—this unreserved admission of logical results, is rare in our days, and is even startling by its strangeness, though familiar enough to the students of the sturdy old puritan divinity.

On subjects so thoroughly discussed as have been those embraced in the list we have given, it would be too much to expect anything like originality of view. It could be only left to the writer to select from the all possible views which have been advanced the one he preferred, and enforce

enforce it by such considerations as his reading or thought may have suggested. There is, however, considerable originality of a secondary kind, and some of the discourses embody much freshness of view and statement, vigorously and freely uttered. Perhaps one of the least conspicuous of these discourses is the most original, being on a subject which has been less explored than the others. This is the one in which the preacher argues that the election of Matthias to the apostleship was not written as an example, but a warning; and contends that the election was altogether unauthorised, and a mistake, and was eventually superseded by the Divine appointment of St. Paul to the apostleship.

Upon the whole, this is a remarkable book, well worthy the attention of our readers; for even those who may not be prepared to go all the way with the author in the conclusions he reaches, will possess in a concise and intelligible shape the best arguments on the side he adopts on questions of great interest, and which must occupy some place in the thoughts of every reflecting man.

Sermons. By the late Rev. WILLIAM RAMSAY, Minister of Guthrie. Blackwood. Edinburgh. 1851.

THIS is one of the somewhat numerous collections of sermons, the publication of which originates in 'the strongly expressed desire, on the part of many friends, to have some memorial of one they so much loved and admired.' As the object of such posthumous publications is more than half private, they come into the class of privileged productions, and their merits are seldom closely scrutinized, unless the author had while he lived acquired a public reputation. Most of these productions stand much in need of the indulgence thus accorded to them; but the small volume now before us is not of the number. The discourses show such merits in thought, style, and arrangement, as create a regret that the author was so early taken from his service and labour here below. He was taken at the early age of twenty-eight; and we are informed that most of the sermons in the volume were composed between his twenty-first and twenty-fourth year. This considered, the maturity of thought and of Christian experience which they manifest is remarkable; while the lucid diction in which the important statement, the impressive thought, and the felicitous image is set forth, raise the work much above the general level of the class to which it belongs, and entitles it to the attention of those who are partial to this kind of reading.

Bath Fables; on Morals, Manners, and Faith. With Illustrative Prose, from many Writers of celebrity. By SHERIDAN WILSON, F.S.A. London. Longman. 1850.

THERE is a peculiarity in this work which entitles it to a passing notice, even in a Journal of Sacred Literature. The author was formerly for many years engaged in the Mediterranean Mission of the London Missionary Society, and published a work called 'Sixteen Years

Years in Malta and Greece.' In the present book the old style of fable is applied to new themes, and is imbued with a new and higher morality. The author says that if in their composition he has proposed to himself any model, it is Gay for the verse, and Cowper for the moral; and he adds, that 'the present fables aim at a higher standard of morality than is proposed by the great mass of kindred compositions selected from heathen fabulists; for it really seems time to inquire how far the morals of a pagan school befit the holier atmosphere of a Christian people.'

The addition of prose extracts to enforce and illustrate the fable and its moral seems a new feature, and will probably prove an additional attraction. The work is altogether one of pleasant reading for young people, for whom mainly it appears to be designed, though many of the ultimate objects are somewhat beyond the juvenile scope, the moral being aimed at such subjects as Popery, Puseyism, the Bishop of Exeter, Scepticism, Protestants, Liberals, Landlords, and the like. But these matters are of the kind to recommend the book to other than children; and the humorous seriousness of the author, his large knowledge, and the fluency of his verse, have enabled him to produce a book which may pleasantly beguile a weary hour.

Biblical Commentary on St. Paul's First and Second Epistles to the Corinthians. By HERMANN OLSHAUSEN, D.D. Translated from the German, with additional Notes, by the Rev. J. E. Cox, M.A., F.S.A. Edinburgh. T. and T. Clark. 1851.

THE theological public has reason to rejoice in this valuable addition to the stores of Biblical learning provided by Messrs. T. and T. Clark, to whom we already owe translations of Olshausen's 'Commentary on the Gospels and on the Epistle to the Romans;' and who intend during the present year to issue the remainder of his Commentaries on the Epistles of St. Paul—being all published by the lamented author before his death. Olshausen has merits of his own distinct from those of all other commentators, and unsurpassed, if equalled, by any other; and nothing but the want of information as to the value of his expositions can excuse any Biblical student for remaining unpossessed of them—especially since the present publishers have rendered them attainable at an easy rate, in their own language.

The successive portions of Olshausen's Biblical Commentary (*Biblisches Commentar*), which have been produced by the Messrs. Clark, have been translated by different hands, and sometimes a single volume has been the work of two translators. All these have, we believe, complained of the hardship of their task in rendering such a writer as Olshausen into English. The difficulty is really great; for to the ordinary difficulties of infusing the genius of the German language into the expressions of our own, and of adopting phraseology as simple, yet as comprehensive—as copious, yet as emphatic as the original—are in the present instance added those which result from the peculiarities of the author's style, and his originality of thought and expression,
which

which are such as render him perhaps the most impracticable for translation of all recent German theologians. Mr. Cox has fairly grappled with these difficulties, and has succeeded in producing what appears to us a very creditable translation of a most important work.

It may be right to apprise the reader of one view, not much known in this country, but much seen in this work. It did not originate with Olshausen, but was adopted by him from Neander. According to this view, the divisions of the Church at Corinth are elucidated on the assumption that the *οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, whom divines of our own country have usually supposed to be the true believers in Christ, were a distinct schismatical party; and as no designation for such a party exists in our language, the German appellation has in this translation been very properly retained, so that wherever the *Christianer* or the *Christus parthei* is mentioned in the original, it is represented by the former of these words in the translation.

As the readers of this Journal may be interested in having Olshausen's sentiments on the subject of Paul's vision, to which an article is devoted in this Number, we give some sentences from his discussion of the subject:—

'The Apostle's earthly perceptions were depressed, or in abeyance throughout; and his divine perception powerfully enhanced through the co-operation of the Spirit. It may also have really happened in this occurrence that a temporary abandonment of the body by the soul took place.... In that paradisaical era of light [to which whether in the body or out of the body he was admitted], he received wonderful impressions, which he describes as rendered perceptive to him through the medium of hearing. He communicates nothing further concerning them, because, as a human being, he felt himself incapable of adequately doing it. Harmonious, part spiritual intuition, can never receive expression through the language of men, which receives and communicates in part only. It is not to be considered that any command was issued not to communicate what he received, for the *οὐκ ἐξου ἀνθρώπῳ λαλῆσαι* forbids the supposition. These words are not to be translated, "it may not be said to a man;" for Paul was a man, and it was nevertheless said to him; but "a man has not the power to express it."—pp. 369, 370.

The Miracles of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; with the Practical Exposition of JOHN BIRD SUMNER, D.D., Archbishop of Canterbury. London. C. Cox. 1851.

THIS work is extracted, with the author's permission, from the Archbishop's larger work on the Four Gospels, by the Rev. George Wilkinson. It is a very commendable attempt to render the contents of a well-known and valuable work open to general use. The editor has executed his task with skill and judgment; and the boldness of the type will render the book acceptable to aged persons, whose comfort is but little consulted in the modern typography of works of this description. The book is a fit sequel to the volume of Selections from the Archbishop's work noticed by us in vol. iv. p. 188. His task in this instance is more simple—the subjects dictating the selection; and the only question as to the order in which the parables should be arranged. In this respect Mr. Wilkinson has adopted the arrangement proposed by Doddridge and acquiesced in by Bickersteth and others.

Fragments

Fragments of College and Pastoral Life. A Memoir of the late Rev. John Clark of Glasgow. With Selections from Essays, Lectures, and Sermons. By the Rev. JOHN CAIRNS, A.M. Edinburgh. Riphurst and Sons. 1851.

THE Memoir which occupies about one-third of this small volume is of very considerable interest, as exhibiting the career—cut short by cholera at the age of thirty-one—of a young man of a strongly metaphysical cast of mind, whom Mr. Cairns characterises as a ‘most promising thinker and faithful Christian minister.’ The Memoir is stated to have been written chiefly with an eye to the wants, difficulties, and dangers of students in the midst of their college life, and is, in this point of view, curious and valuable. Mr. Clark acquired a prominent place at Edinburgh, in the class of Sir William Hamilton, as a profound and original thinker; and in this position acquired the friendship of his biographer, whose attention was first drawn to him by the comments of the accomplished Professor upon a ‘vigorous but obscure paper’ which he read on the faculty of abstraction. The young student then endeavoured to explain and defend his views; and, pursues Mr. Cairns,—

‘I was much struck with the modesty as well as firmness with which he spoke. He was then about twenty years of age. The light of intelligence, purity, and benevolence was in his face, and his whole manner inspired me with respect, and at the same time an interest which soon brought about a companionship.’

When the young man sat down at length to the formal study of theology, he felt, and strongly expresses, what many have felt in like circumstances, the revulsion of the change from the liberty of speculation for the fixedness of unhesitating subjection to Scripture in his new province. Perhaps the training he had gone through was not the best for ministerial usefulness, and may go some way to account for the troubles which the remainder of the Memoir records, arising from his services proving unacceptable to a large portion of his congregation. This part of the Memoir is painfully interesting.

Among the Remains the principal paper is a ‘Vindication of Metaphysical Speculations’—a vigorous and able dissertation, which, although incomplete, bears stronger evidence of the ability which the biographer ascribes to the writer than is perhaps to be found in the Lectures on St. Luke and the three short sermons that follow. There is certainly enough in the book to show that Mr. Clark was a man of promising talents, whose loss may well be deplored.

Horæ Vacivæ; a Thought-Book of the Wise Spirits of all Ages and all Countries, fit for all Men and all Hours. Collected, arranged, and edited by JAMES ELMES. London. Longman. 1851.

WE must confess to an old liking for books of this class, which used formerly to be more abundantly produced than at the present day. Such collections are seldom, however, wholly satisfactory—and often disappointing; whether it be that the faculty of appreciating subtle or profound points of thought be as rare as that of deep thinking itself, or that the

reproduced thought, separated from its context; does not strike the reader with the same force as it did the collector who viewed it in its proper connection. Yet there are perhaps as many sentences that gain as that lose by being separated from their context, as many a precious and pearly thought often lies hid and overlaid in loads of slushy matter where few would look for it. Still, few can see the same object with exactly the same eyes; and hence it is perhaps that no collection of thoughtful or splendid sentences has been received with universal appreciation. The present collection is an exceedingly fine one. The editor is clearly a man of curious and extensive reading, as well as of thoughtful and apprehensive intellect, with a keen relish for the beautiful and suggestive in thought and language. Few readers will miss the point of any sentence in his collection, or fail to justify the editor for introducing it. Although the book is rather small, it is very full of golden matter, selected from a most diversified list of writers of all times and countries, many of which never before figured in a work of this sort. Even the Talmud is here—as might be expected from one whose intimacy with Talmudical literature has contributed to the instruction and entertainment of the readers of this Journal. If we may judge from the frequency with which their names occur, the two Jeremies—Taylor and Collier—with South, are the favourites of Mr. Elmes, who evinces his affection for old books by the very peculiar type and binding he gives to this solid and attractive volume. In the preface the editor explains that the public is indebted for this collection to the occupation he found in making extracts (which he often could not read) from books printed in large type, during a recent partial relief from a deprivation of sight of more than four years' duration.

BIBLICAL INTELLIGENCE.

CODEX VATICANUS NOV. TESTAM.—Respecting Cardinal Mai's long expected edition of the Vatican Codex, some particulars are given ('from an occasional correspondent') in the *Tablet* (Roman Catholic) newspaper, for March 15, which will be interesting to our readers.

We were in some expectation of a *review* of a work concerning which we have much desired to be able to furnish information, and to which we have been unable to find access. But the writer, after much preliminary matter, very little to the purpose, states:—'We are not now going to review this great and immortal work of Cardinal Mai, as we do not deem it proper to enter upon its consideration until it becomes *publici juris*, and be submitted to the universal judgment of the learned.' He then applies himself to answer a charge copied into the 'Edinburgh Review,' from Sir Charles Lyell's work on the United States. The charge is this:—

'It is well known by those who have of late years frequented the literary circles of Rome, that the learned Cardinal Mai was prevented, in 1838, from publishing his edition of the *Codex Vaticanus*, because he could not obtain leave from the late Pope (Gregory XVI.) to omit the interpolated passages, and had satisfied himself that they were wanting in all the most ancient MSS. at Rome and Paris. The Pontiff refused, because he was bound by the decrees of the Council of Trent, and of a Church pretending to infallibility, which had solemnly sanctioned the Vulgate; and the Cardinal had too much good faith to give the authority of his name to what he regarded as a forgery.'—('A Second Visit to the U. S. of N. America,' vol. i., 223.)

The answer to this is in substance as follows:—

'Both from Leo XII. and Gregory XVI., Cardinal Mai received permission to publish the celebrated copy of the Bible which is preserved in the Vatican library, and is marked 1209; this manuscript is justly considered the most ancient copy of the Scriptures in existence, even by those who vaunt the superior age of the *text* of the Cambridge MS. This permission has never been revoked—never limited. The *Codex* is already printed, and this we affirm from our own personal knowledge and inspection of the sheets; it will be published as soon as the extensive critical apparatus which is to accompany it will be completed.'

It is added that this assertion contained abundant materials for its refutation.—'For surely the learned Cardinal could not be so disingenuous as to give only an *edition*, a critical *recension* of the text, when he was publishing to the world that his work was a faithful transcript of the Vatican Codex. He could exercise no control over the readings of the MS.; when once it was determined that a certain word, phrase, or passage really exists in it, he had no choice left but to let it remain. He might, indeed, show in his notes whether the passage were an interpolation, but he could not reject it from the text on that score—otherwise his work could not be called the *Codex Vaticanus*. Besides, the late Pontiff was not so very stupid as to require one who was publishing a *manuscript*, to insert all that he considered ought to have been originally inserted in it, and then declare that this *compilation* was the *Codex* itself. . . . The Cardinal received permission from two Pontiffs to publish the manuscript as it stands: every facility has been afforded him in furthering his undertaking; this permission was never revoked; the manuscript is even now *actually printed*, and it will be published when the critical notes destined to illustrate it will be finished. It is, we aver, a faithful transcript of the original—nothing has been added by the Pope, nothing taken away by the Cardinal.'

We are further informed that during the month of April the Cardinal will publish the first six volumes of his *Bibliotheca Nova Patrum Græca et Latina*. One volume consists of whole treatises on the Real Presence and Transubstantiation, another on the Veneration of Images; all have never before been published. When this *Bibliotheca*—consisting of some ten volumes—shall have been published, he will send forth his *Codex Vaticanus* to the criticism of the world.

reproduced thought, separated from its context in Biblical studies will reader with the same force as it did the case reached this country on the proper connection. Yet there are perhaps dangerous disease in the left foot, as that lose by being separated from the. This severe operation he underwent and pearly thought often lies hid in vain, for he died on the 13th of matter where few would look for. This painful intelligence will induce our with exactly the same eyes; and note which Dr. Tregelles gives of his interest of thoughtful or splendid in last August, in the October number of the appreciation. The present

editor is clearly a man. Patrick Fairbairn of Saltoun has been for some thoughtful and appreciative now in the press, a work on Ezekiel. This book, tiful and suggestive, neglected in this country, and there is not a single the point of any that can be said seriously to grapple with the great for introducing its interpretation. It is natural that a book which deals of golden in the language of symbol and type should, in the course of his studies, times and the attention of the author of the *Typology of Scripture*; and we this sort whose qualifications ensure the production of a work creditable to the whose general literature of the country. It is expected that the work will appear in instr-

ma-
Jf
J
BIBLICAL REPOSITORY.—The American quarterly publication which we have so often had occasion to mention, the *Biblical Repository*, has at length terminated its separate career by being united to, or rather merged in, its younger and abler rival, the *Bibliotheca Sacra*. Recollecting that both publications were founded by Professor Robinson of New York, and were each at their commencement edited by him, this final union of publications so similar appears natural and proper, while it may be hoped that the number of contributors and subscribers left free by this arrangement from their engagement with the 'Biblical Repository' will give much increase of strength and vigour to a publication so highly creditable to the theological literature of the United States as the 'Bibliotheca Sacra.' Its form is retained in the united publication, and the literature of the first number thus issued is of the quality it has usually supplied. The only differences are, that 'American Biblical Repository' appears as a second title, and that the names of the two latest editors of that publication are added to those of the special co-operators, thus:—'Conducted by B. B. Edwards and E. A. Park, Professors at Andover, with the special co-operation of Dr. Robinson, Professors Stuart and H. B. Smith, and Rev. J. M. Sherwood.' The new number contains several very able articles, but is unusually 'heavy' to most readers from the disproportionate quantity of matter on the general subject of philosophy, a fact of which the conductors are aware, and for which they render a satisfactory apology.

WYCLIFFE'S BIBLE.—We are obliged to defer to the next Number the account of this important work which we had hoped to give in the present. The Preface furnishes a most interesting and valuable account of Anglo-Saxon and Early English Versions, and its presence will render necessary a more extended account of the work than was in the first instance contemplated.

THE REPHAIM.—In the *Athenæum* for March 15 there is an abstract of a curious paper by Miss Fanny Corboux, read before the Syro-Egyptian Society, on the Rephaim, and their connection with Egyptian history. The lady's ingenious and learned argument goes to show that the Rephaim of Scripture were no other than the Hyk-sos, or royal Shepherds, who took the lead in the conquest of Egypt. We see some objections to this theory, and to the arguments by which it is supported; but we must suspend our judgment until the paper comes before us in a more complete shape.

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS.

ENGLISH.

- Achilli (Rev. G.)—Dealings with the Inquisition; or, Papal Rome, her Priests and her Jesuits: with important Discourses. 8vo. pp. 500.
- Anderson (Rev. J.)—Pencilings in Palestine: being Scenes descriptive of the Holy Land, and other Countries in the East. 12mo. pp. 130.
- Banister (Rev. J. T.)—Pictorial Geography of the Holy Land; designed to elucidate the Imagery of Scripture and demonstrate the Fulfilment of Prophecy. 8vo. pp. 376.
- Bartlett (W. H.)—Scripture Sites and Scenes, from actual Survey in Egypt, Arabia, and Palestine. 8vo. pp. 190.
- Boys (Rev. R.)—Primitive Obliquities; or, a Review of the Epistles of the New Testament in reference to prevailing Offences in the Church. 12mo. pp. 224.
- Castro (A. de).—The Spanish Protestants, and their Persecution by Philip II. Translated from the Spanish by Thomas Parker, Esq. 8vo. Cloth.
- Cumming (H.)—Lectures for the Times; or, Illustrations and Refutations of the Errors of Romanism and Tractarianism. New Edition. 12mo. pp. 404. Cloth, 6s.
- Eight Lectures, delivered before the Young Man's Christian Association, Dublin. 12mo. pp. 236.
- Elmes (James).—Horæ Vacivæ; or, a Thought Book of the Wise Spirits of all Ages and all Countries. Fcp. 16mo. pp. 318.
- Fergusson (J.)—The Palaces of Nineveh and Persepolis restored: an Essay. 8vo. pp. 378. With 45 woodcuts.
- Frere (Rev. J.)—Mormonites, or Latter Day Saints: a short History of this Sect. With an Account of the Real Origin of the Book of Mormon. 12mo. pp. 24.
- Giles (Dr.)—An Historical Inquiry concerning the Age, Authorship, and Authenticity of the Old Testament. By the Rev. Dr. Giles. 8vo. pp. 354.
- Hakewill (E. C.)—The Temple: an Essay on the Ark, the Tabernacle, and the Temple of Jerusalem; showing the Correspondence of their Forms with those of Classical Architecture. 8vo. pp. 124.
- Harcourt (Rev. L. V.)—Lectures on the Four Gospels harmonised. 3 vols. 8vo. pp. 1872.
- Henderson (Rev. Dr. E.)—The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah and that of the Lamentations. Translated from the Hebrew, with a Commentary, Critical, Philological, and Exegetical. 8vo. pp. 306.
- Inauguration of the New College of the Free Church, Edinburgh. With Introductory Lectures. 12mo. pp. 232.
- Ken (Bishop).—The Life of. By a Layman. 8vo. pp. 540.
- Lays of Palestine. 8vo. pp. 406.
- Neander (A.)—Memorials of Augustus Neander. Translated from the German. By William Farrer, LL.B. 8vo. pp. 52.
- General History of the Christian Religion and Church. Translated by J. Torrey. Complete in 6 vols. 8vo. Edinburgh.

Olshausen—

- Olshausen (H.)—Biblical Commentary on St. Paul's 1st and 2nd Epistles to the Corinthians. Translated from the German by the Rev. John Edmund Cox. 8vo. Edinburgh. pp. 390.
- Our Saviour; with Prophets and Apostles. Edited by the Rev. J. M. Wainright.
- Peile (Rev. T. W.)—Annotations on the Apostolical Epistles. Vol. III. Thessalonians—Hebrews. 8vo. pp. 446.
- Reading (W.)—The History of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; with suitable Meditations and Prayers. 32mo. pp. 410.
- Rogers (Rev. J. G.)—Christianity and its Evidences: a Course of Six Lectures. 12mo. pp. 154.
- Sabbaths.—An Inquiry into the Origin of Septenary Institutions, and the Authority for a Sabbatical Observance of the Modern Sunday.
- Sacred Incidents, Doctrinally considered and Poetically described. 4 vols. 8vo. pp. 622. Cloth.
- Seven (The) Days; or the Old and New Creation. 12mo. pp. 400.
- Stebbing (Rev. Dr.)—Jesus: a Poem, in Six Books, &c. 12mo. pp. 210.
- Tennent (Sir J. E.)—Christianity in Ceylon; its Introduction and Progress under the Portuguese, the Dutch, the British, and American Missions. 8vo. pp. 358. With Illustrations.
- Trench (Rev. Francis).—Life and Character of St. John the Evangelist. 8vo. pp. 256.
- Tyas (R.)—Flowers from the Holy Land: being an Account of the chief Plants named in Scripture; with Historical, Geographical, and Poetical Illustrations. 8vo. pp. 206.
- Wilkinson (Rev. G.)—A Selection from his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury's Practical Explanation of the Epistles. 12mo. pp. 350.
- Wright (Rev. A. C.)—The Weekly Sabbath no part of the Ceremonial Law; a Discourse. 12mo. pp. 48.

FOREIGN.

- Cellerier (J. E.)—Etude et Commentaire sur l'Epttre de S. Jacques. 8vo. Genève.
- Chenevière (M.)—De la Divine Autorité des Ecrivains et des Livres du Nouveau Testament. 8vo.
- Corpus Reformatorum. Post C. G. Bretschneiderum, ed. H. E. Bindseil. Vol. XVI. Et s. t.; Ph. Melancthon's Opera quæ supersunt omnia. Vol. XVI. 4to. Halle.
- Ewald (H.)—Die drei ersten Evangelien übersetzt und erklärt. 8vo. Göttingen.
- Handbuch (Kurzgefasstes Exegetisches) zum alten Testament. Lief. 10. Das Buch Daniel, erklärt von F. Hitzig. 8vo. Leipzig.
- Hofmann (R.)—Das Leben Jesu nach den Apokryphen im Zusammenhange aus den Quellen erzählt und wissenschaftlich untersucht. 8vo. Leipzig.
- Kohlgruber (J.)—Hermeneutica Biblia Generalis. 8vo. Innsbruck.
- Movers (F. C.)—Die Phönizier: Das phönizische Alterthum. Vol. II. Geschichte der Colonien. 8vo. (Berlin.)
- Munier (D.)—Conférences sur la Lecture de l'Ecriture Sainte; prêchées à Genève. 8vo.
- Nicolas (A.)—Etudes Philosophiques sur le Christianisme. 5th Edition. 4 vols. 12mo.

Olshausen.

Olshausen. Commentar über das Neue Testament, *so sadly interrupted by the author's death, will be continued by* Drs. Ebrard and Wiesinger. Vol. V. Part I.

Schroeder (J. F.)—Satzungen u. Gebräuche d. talmudisch-rabbinischen Judenthums. Ein Handbuch f. Juristen, Staatsmänner, Theologen u. Geschichtsforscher. 8vo.

Soerensen (Th.)—Untersuchungen über Inhalt und Alter des Alttestamentlichen Pentateuch. Vol. I. Historisch-krit. Commentar zur Genesis. 8vo. Kiel.

Testamentum Novum Latine Interprete Hieronymo. Ex Celeberrimo Codice Amiatino omnium et antiquissimo et præstantissimo nunc primum edidit *Const. Tischendorf*. 4to. Lipsiæ.

* * Although the names of the Contributors to this Journal are no longer given in connection with their articles, the publication still remains an organ for the *discussion* of subjects in Sacred Literature. The views advanced will thus necessarily vary, and are to be regarded as those of the several writers—the Editor not being held responsible for every opinion and argument, but only for the general adaptation of the articles to the design of the Journal.

[In the last Number a title for Vol. VII. was given, by mistake, instead of one for Vol. VI.: the right title is now supplied.]

1. The first part of the document is a list of names and dates.

2. The second part of the document is a list of names and dates.



